The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE race for rearmament is on: Britain is, we are told, to spend £1,500,000,000 in the next five years. The "recall to religion" has been sounded: it is doubtful whether as yet it has aroused one-tenth of the interest called forth by the armaments programme. About both it is essential that something should be said. Free Churchmen and Anglicans are united in hoping and praying and working for a Christian England; Congregationalists have for some time been engaged on an "Inner Mission", which, beginning with church members themselves, aims at inspiring them to go forth and win those outside. And yet somehow there is a feeling abroad that there is something out of focus about the present campaign. The uneasiness takes three forms.

The first was expressed to Mr. H. W. Peet by

> a very wise man, whose counsels are equally sought by leading Anglicans and Nonconformists . . . (who) compared the Archbishop's appeal unfavourably with, for instance, the admirable talk on "Church, Community, and State" given on the wireless by a layman, Sir Walter Moberly . . . (and) agreed that there was a note of prophecy about Sir Walter's utterance which was absent from that of the Primate. "And", added my friend, "I am not sure that the Recall campaign is beginning at the right end. The job of the churches is not to force a revival but to make the rough places smooth for it when and if it comes. The great revival led by John Wesley in the eighteenth century was a gradual growth, and when Moody came to this country in the last century it was some time before people began to listen to him. Efforts to stimulate religious revival artificially defeat their own ends. There is a danger in setting times and seasons, and I feel, too, that just now the approach may smack a little too much of the spirit 'Our nation is in a bad way. Why not try religion?' The Eternal Powers are not likely to be deceived by this".

The second springs from the unfortunate association between the Archbishop's call and the abdication of King Edward VIII. A week before the Archbishop spoke to the nation about the place of religion he delivered an address which was fiercely resented, in which he rebuked some of the friends of the monarch; among ordinary men the speech was generally condemned, not because of approval of any "fast set", but because it was held—no doubt most unfairly—that the Archbishop spoke smooth things and was expert in the use

of the trowel until "the man was down", and only then became, as somebody said, "an Old Testament prophet". Probably this criticism was quite wide of the mark, but it served to counteract, and even nullify, what the Archbishop had to say a week later. More important is the widespread impression that the Churches isolate and magnify one particular form of sin: let there be pride, and avarice, and snobbery, and hypocrisy, and the Church is silent, but about sexual sin there is a great outcry: how different, men say, from the attitude of Him Who mixed with publicans and harlots and kept His severest rebukes for the respectable sins. Confirmation has been found for this criticism in prolonged newspaper correspondence in which Christian divines have argued about the exact words, and the exact meaning of words, used by Jesus in regard to divorce: even scholars who would scorn to be thought literalists seem to lose all sense of perspective in regard to this question. On other matters they say easily—and rightly—"We cannot, of course, be sure that we have the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord; the important thing is that we have the spirit of His teaching". But on this matter!! While the world plunges madly into war we tithe our mint, anise, and cummin—and wonder why the world does not listen to our lugubrious tones as we speak of the recall to religion.

And thirdly there is concern about a "recall". To what period is it we are going back? To the early nineteenth century, when the Bishops voted against all social reform, and Nonconformists believed in *laisser faire,* no matter what that meant in conditions of employment for women and children? To the first half of the eighteenth, when dry bones filled cathedrals and chapels alike? To days when religious wars were the worst of all wars? No, we shall be told, but to the golden age, to the religion of apostolic days, when there were added to the church day by day those who were being saved, when men and women so witnessed that in a short time they were said to "turn the world upside down". Yes, if we can but recover that spirit, and feel the glow of religious fervour, how glorious it will be. Those were the days when the apostles could say, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk", but when they could also say "Silver and gold have I none". Then men and women flocked to the church—at a time when not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble were called. But those who were called so lived that people "took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus". Our pagan population will be impressed only when the lives of twentieth century Christians are patently different from the lives of other men. It is often so among the rank and file of the Church of Christ, thank God: in many a rectory and country manse, in many an artisan and middle class home, there are people whose lives, because they are a constant sacrifice, speak continually of Christ; it is because of them the Church has continued to live.

The healing of the world is in its nameless saints,
Each separate star seems nothing,
But a myriad stars
Break up the night and make it beautiful.

But is the same true at the top? Do the "leaders of the Church" witness by their lives in the same way? Do they not love money and power just as do the "worldlings", and like to be called "Your Grace" and "My Lord" and "the learned doctor" and "the eloquent preacher"? They find—these bishops and secretaries, dons and editors—so many things absolutely necessary: houses and servants and cars and first-class season tickets and clubs—can any good thing come out of the "Athenæum"? (the *Modern Churchman,* by the way, points out that Free Church leaders "can dine with the Bishops at the Athenæum, though precluded from partaking with them at the Lord's Table"). If Christ *did* come to Chicago, or London, can it be conceived that he would need all the things we find essential to-day?

It is, of course, easy to see how it all comes about. There are wives to provide for in case of death, and children to educate, and for their sakes we must mix with "nice people", and so the bishops and clergy, the secretaries and editors, must watch the Stock Exchange, keep in touch with people in good positions, save time and nervous energy by securing what comfort they can—and live just as do those who make no Christian profession, much less believing that the Christian Gospel is the greatest thing in the world.

It is, of course, an "inner mission" for every individual Christian that is needed. When all Christians do their daily work so well that neighbours "sit up and take notice", living as simply as possible and not laying house to house and field to field; when ministers put all their heart and soul into the ministry, not giving half their time to the "Vacant Churches" list, longing for a suburb, and running away when the job seems hard; and when leaders lead in sacrifice and devotion—then the revival will come.

But let the Church not turn its eyes back: Lot's wife did that with dire results. It is a forward march to which Christians are called. It is a living Christ who shall lead unto all the truth who summons and commands. There will be no revival of religion for a Church which believes that God has no more to say to men: and truth will not reach those who live in the twentieth century if it be chanted in the language of the fourth. Some, even in the Free Churches, would do well to ponder the words of John Everard, written in *The Gospel-Treasury Opened* in 1659:

> But for Dwarfs, whose Growth is stunted, they are at their highest, and will never grow taller: I mean such who profess, or suppose themselves tall Christians, but are not so much as little Children, nor cannot Endure to hear you speak of growing taller,

> nor to hear of New Light, or a New Birth, or that any should know more than they, this is hateful to them; for they think they have been brought up with the Scriptures, they have been at the University, . . . studied all Points in Divinity, searched out the Judgment of most Authors, and it may be, have Epitomized the Quintessence of all their Judgments; and shall we tell these men of New Light? They cry, New lights are Old Errors: Do you think that these men are true Disciples or fit to be Christ's Disciples, by him To be led into Truth? . . . And indeed, we much wonder to see a Dwarf, because that if he live to be never so old, yet he is but Of a Child's stature, and will never increase or grow higher: what are such Christians (if they may be so called) but Dwarfs and Monsters? . . . who cannot indure Strong Meat to make them grow tall men in Christ, but are still feeding themselves and others with nothing but Milk.

* * *

But what of the £1,500,000,000? Have members of the Government whose blundering, dilatory methods blocked possible disarmament any sense of remorse, we wonder? Can Sir John Simon sleep o' nights?

And does the Government really propose to spend this money? Or is it just a gigantic bluff, our way of saying to the poorer nations

> We don't want to fight,
> But, *by Jingo,* if we do?

Bluff of this sort is dangerous. If there was one hoary fallacy which it was agreed had been discredited for all time it was that which says "If you want peace you must prepare for war", and now every nation in the world is acting as if the fallacy were true. This planet must, after all, be the lunatic asylum for the universe. It looks as if the Christian Church must begin again at the beginning—preach and live simple honesty, truth, and peace. We have Lenin declaring

> we must be ready for sacrifice of every kind, and even if need be to practise everything possible; ruses and tricks, illegal methods; be ready to be silent and hide the truth; in short, it is from the interests of the class war that we deduce our morality.

We have the dictators of Germany and Italy acting in direct defiance of their words and promises, and Britain building planes and tanks for—defence. We have the world altogether ignoring the Church, so that Brunner declares:

> Therefore all that the word "Church" signifies means in our times practically nothing to large portions of the populace. The Church as a rule hardly represents an appreciable factor in the counsels of the peoples, in the decisions of economic authorities, in the customs which stamp the mind of the individual. Our time is distinguished from all earlier times by this characteristic, that it presents for the first time in world history the phenomenon of mass atheism and a fully secularized culture and civilization.

> This was a thing unknown to the ancient world, to the middle ages and the times of the Reformation.

Nothing less than absolute and entire consecration will serve to meet such a condition of things. And to all the Churches as well as to the Church of England these words of Canon Major apply :

> When the Primate concluded his earnest address by exhorting the nation to re-found their personal and national life on a rock, he was referring, as the context shews, to the concluding words of the Sermon on the Mount. If the Church of England were to seek to refound its life on that rock and would cease to stress its ecclesiastical, sacramental, sacerdotal ceremonial activities, it would be doing much to procure a return of multitudes of ordinary men and women to its worship and leadership. It is the English Church, divided, decadent, deserted, which, much more than the nation, is in dire need of re-founding its life upon the Rock of the Sermon on the Mount.

* * *

In the *Congregational Quarterly* for April, 1925, it was our privilege to announce the formation of the Halley Stewart Trust. The income then placed at the disposal of the Trustees was £2,520 per annum. It has now grown to something like six times that amount. Sir Halley Stewart died in his 100th year. We said of him in announcing the foundation of the Trust :

> Mr. Halley Stewart, J.P. . . . is an outstanding example of a type that it should be Congregationalism's peculiar genius to produce—the type that has the power to retain tolerance of mind and breadth of vision with increasing years. Always a fighter for freedom he does not fall into the common error of supposing that the victories he has helped to win have secured all that needs to be gained for mankind's complete liberty : at the age of eighty-seven he recognizes that the present and every succeeding generation must fight their own battles, win new heights, and conquer new territories for the fuller development of human life.

Much has been written about this fine old Independent, the Grand Old Man of Congregationalism. We do not propose to repeat what we have written elsewhere. It is possible, however, to add part of a personal impression which did not appear in print :

> Of theology and theologians he had a profound suspicion : I remember his once taking me to task for using the term "theology" in a sermon instead of "religion". His belief in freedom sometimes took forms which embarrassed his supporters. He was never a teetotaller, and once beautifully "caught out" a meeting, I think of the Sussex County Union. He said, "I have always been a non-smoker", at which there were loud cheers. He continued, "I have always been a non-abstainer", and the applause was renewed. And then the audience began to think what they were applauding.
>
> Efforts were often made to get Sir Halley to write his remini-

scences, but without success. He would talk, and talk effectively, about life in his father's home, about his own ministerial experiences, about business and politics and religion, but he could not be persuaded to transfer his words to paper. Only once was he persuaded to write in the Congregational Quarterly—a summing-up of a discussion on "Sunday Games". It was about this time that he said:

"My billiard table, bowling green, and tennis court have never been used on Sundays, but if the Church to which I belong were to pass a resolution denouncing Sunday games as un-Christian and reflecting on those who participate in them, I should at once join the ranks of the condemned by engaging in Sunday pastimes for the nonce to vindicate the cause of religious freedom".

I have, however, a wonderful collection of letters from him, for he was a great letter writer—in a beautifully firm hand which to the end of his days put to shame younger men—his letters, indeed, were easier to read than those of any of his Trustees!

He had a great belief in the consecration to the work of the Kingdom of God of all the best of a man's intellectual powers. Just before his death we were talking of a minister who had the reputation of being a good business man, and he remarked, "I have always said there was no reason why a minister should be a fool".

It has been said that Sir Halley was the last of the old Independents. We hope that this is far from being the case. The world and the Church will be poor indeed without those with the same convictions, even if they have not the same ability to express them.

* * *

It is credibly reported that at the Induction Service of a Congregational Minister an item on the Order of Service read as follows:

The Act of Appointment: The Rev. A.B.C., Moderator of the Blank Province.

Well! Well! It seems worthy of note that on the same Order there is no address on "Congregational Principles", nor is there any statement by the Church Secretary. The Holy Spirit, it may be presumed, had some share in the call to the minister, and no doubt the church itself took part. All these, however, are evidently subordinate to

THE ACT OF APPOINTMENT
by the Moderator of the Province.

It is not to be believed, of course, that any Moderator would be so foolish as to authorize an Order of Service of this kind. There are obstacles enough in their way without adding others: it might be well, as opportunity arises, as in this case, to point out to well-meaning ministers or church secretaries responsible the error of their ways.

* * *

THE *Madras Guardian* has recently had some important comment in its recent issues on the Church Union Movement in South India. Supporters of the Scheme in this country have recently been in an equivocal position. For long they urged on doubters that the Indian Churches must be allowed to settle the matter for themselves and that British opinion must not be pressed upon them. There was general agreement about this, but when some of the Indian parties to the Scheme began to express doubts and desire delay, its English champions were in a quandary. Now we have an Indian paper saying:

> Once again an attempt is made to prove that the scheme is not imposed from elsewhere but is the spontaneous expression of the Indian Church and its handiwork. But "it is true, the missionary members of the Joint Committee took an important part in the actual shaping of most of the proposals". The Church bodies, we are assured, have been active participants and that is offered as a guarantee that Indian opinion has been dominant. The truth however is that even in church bodies, it is missionary opinion that rules on this question. This manifesto signed by numerous Indian friends and every previous document of the kind, have laboriously argued the point as to whether Indians or missionaries have shaped the scheme. The debate has reached limits which must cause much amusement. We are unable to see why missionaries should be so apologetic about the dominant part they have played. If they seek to correct the mistakes of denominationalism, they do but right and their "fuller knowledge" entitles them to undo what they have done before. Indians supply the strong sentiment in favour of a United Church, Missionaries find the solutions. The vast majority of Indian Christians do not understand the mysteries of the scheme; it has already gone beyond their comprehension. A few have become experts and heartily engage in the task of alterations. A few others have also become experts but oppose it.
>
> When the last Assembly of the South India United Church voted to ask for further time to consider the Union Scheme, it was not so much to study the details any further, but rather in view of the deadlock that had occurred, to keep the scheme alive in the hope that a way out might be discovered. There was no confidence that the hope would be fulfilled, neither, it was felt, was it a matter regarding which hope should be abandoned. The fact is that the criticisms expressed by "some prominent Indian Christian leaders, mostly laymen" . . . are now shared by a considerably larger number and cannot be quietened by appeals to their kindliness. They need conviction before they can consent. It is by such appeals that thus far the average Christian has been led for many years to believe in the scheme, with the result that to the extent that closer knowledge of the scheme spread, there was at least as much opposition as support for it.

* * *

Two books recently issued drive home the fact that in Christian Missions as in much else "the woman pays". The Rev. E. A. Payne's *The First Generation,* a book of sketches of the pioneers of the Baptist Missionary Society, makes sad—and sometimes humiliating—reading. The missionaries were brave men, prepared for any sacrifice, but it seems to be assumed that their wives, in addition to all other hardships, must bear children regularly. One wife dies, and is almost immediately succeeded by another. Children are born with great frequency, and often live but a short time. A statistician could produce appalling figures from Mr. Payne's pages.

Mrs. Pearl Buck's *Fighting Angel* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) tells round the life of her father the same story which she outlined with such poignancy in *The Exile,* where her mother is the centre of the picture. To the man, the work is everything: the woman and her children nothing. Mrs. Buck, in one or two revealing paragraphs, suggests that missionaries and their wives often pay a great price in other ways, though it is not clear whether she is referring to the present day or to two or three decades ago. It is to be hoped that the increased knowledge of mankind provided by psychology is placed at the disposal of missionaries to-day by the Societies to which they belong. Does a Society's medical examination merely aim at testing a candidate's physical fitness, or does it include instruction by a skilled and sympathetic adviser in the peculiar problems, mental as well as physical, which face those going out to a life which accentuates the stresses alike on celibates and on young married people? Is anything done systematically to enable missionaries to know themselves? The inevitable hardships are sufficient in themselves; any which can be avoided should be avoided. We should not like to think that the lot of the wives of the first generation of Baptist ministers is that of missionaries anywhere to-day, or that the neuroses Mrs. Buck describes are more common in missionary circles than elsewhere.

The same subject is mentioned in the Rev. J. C. Heinrich's *The Psychology of a Suppressed People* (Allen & Unwin, 5s. and 3s. 6d.), which tells us much in its description of missionary life in India, but rather irritates in its attempt to translate the problems it presents into psychological jargon. The relevant passages quote an article in *Mental Hygiene* reporting a psychiatrist's investigation prompted by

> a communication from a certain well-known Bishop in a foreign Mission field inquiring as to the reasons for the frequency of mental irritability and breakdown in the tropics among the foreigners sent to those countries.

One of his findings was that

> out of 203 missionaries in one single Mission invalided back to the Homeland from China, 25 per cent were sent back because of neurasthenia, 8.8 per cent for insanity, and 2.9 per cent because of other neuroses, a total of 36.7 per cent of all the cases

> of serious illness in the Mission group were suffering from psychopathological conditions.

The article is entitled "The Call to Foreign Missions. Its Effect on Unstable Personalities", and our concern is to discover how far "unstable personalities" are now weeded out, and how far those accepted as missionaries are prepared for the difficulties which face them. Mr. Heinrich also quotes an article in the *International Review of Missions*:

> In 1923 a study was made of this question among a staff of 1,200 missionaries, 560 of whom reported all causes of ill health during a two year period. It was surprising to learn that the greatest loss of time was due to the nervous group of disabilities. The loss from nervous causes reached 24 per cent of the total loss.

These figures, it will be seen, date from fourteen years ago, and it is probable Mrs. Buck's disclosures refer not to the present day, but to a past generation. We hope that is so, for her pages, confirmed as they are by the views of this Indian missionary, otherwise give reason for grave anxiety.

* * *

Mr. Hamilton Fyfe (*Press Parade*: Watts, 2s. 6d.) may be jaundiced in his view of the press, but he is nearer the mark than those who —like Mr. Neville Chamberlain—think the British Press is in every way admirable. Mr. Fyfe's description of the daily round in a newspaper office, his account of the transformation of the Press from Stead and Newnes to Northcliffe, his survey of the subordination of news to advertisements, of views to profits—all these are valuable indeed. He shows how the power of the Press Lords has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished, and in his last chapter points out how the diminution might be effected—on the one hand, by the extension of the use of radio for news purposes: on the other, by the provision by the State of insurance benefits which would undermine the hold the papers secure by this means. A disquieting book, which would have been even more effective if less aggressive.

* * *

An Editorial outburst in our October issue on the English cricket team for Australia brought an amusing correspondence from most parts of the Empire—from schoolboys loyal to Middlesex, Kent, Essex, and Surrey to an Eastern psychologist who based an article on the editorial remark that he must write something or burst! Two faithful supporters of the *Congregational Quarterly* were concerned lest the bias of the comment on the cricket team should undermine the confidence felt in the editorial judgment on other matters! That was indeed kind of them, and we are cordially grateful for a solicitude which, we hope, was in this case a work of supererogation. Before the first Test Match one reader wrote to say that the tour had shown the strictures to be justified in every particular; after England had won

the second Test another reader wrote saying that the Tour had shown that they were quite wrong, and suggesting that handsome apologies were called for!

And now, what? Allowing for bad luck in the way of injuries (it is to be regretted that that fine player Robins was handicapped)—the luck in the way of the wicket was about evenly balanced, except that, as Mr. Cardus pointed out, Verity never had the chance to bowl on a sticky wicket—is there anything in the comment not borne out? G. O. Allen has been a popular captain, and he has had loyal support from all the Press; he has "come off" now and then, but we have had comments like C. B. Fry's "It is nice to see a boundary or two, but Allen is bowling himself too much. The Don revels in him", which emphasize the unwisdom of a fast bowler being captain. Farnes succeeded in the last Test, though even then Kippax said, "Bad catching by Allen and Farnes robbed England of this excellent start", but surely there was justification for the opinion expressed: "I tremble to think what Bradman will do when they [Allen, Farnes, Holmes] bowl".

The only players to return with enhanced reputations are Barnett as an opening bat and Ames as a wicket-keeper: of the rest perhaps only Hammond and Leyland have maintained their high standard. The batting has been woefully weak—Fagg, Fishlock, Worthington failing, and Hardstaff doing himself justice only at the end of the tour. What was needed was stiffening in the batting in the middle—the sort of stiffening the North supplies (Ames can bat well if he goes in when the score is 350 for 2), and a No. 1 bat. It is C. G. Macartney and not a partisan Tyke who said:

> Sutcliffe would have been of untold value as an opening batsman with Barnett.

In future let us have the best team, whether the men be amateurs or professionals, whether they come from this county or from that. And let us have no more of the timeless test. To win the toss and stay in as long as possible, not to get as many runs as possible, but to wear the wicket as much—that is the antithesis of "cricket".

* * *

One of the neatest retorts we have seen for a long time appears in the correspondence columns of *Advance*, the American Congregational Monthly. The Rev. Hubert Herring is the spearhead of the Social Service Movement in the Congregational churches, and he always writes forcibly on matters political, social, and economic. He made some comments on the American Presidential Election which brought from a lady the following letter:

> Mr. Herring says: "The well-dressed and the comfortable did not vote for Mr. Roosevelt. He was elected by the man in overalls . . . I made notes during the months before election on conversations in Pullman cars, hotels, private homes, I learned to

pick a Republican voter by the way he dressed, and I seldom failed".

Now the question which will keep me awake nights till it is answered is: How does Mr. Herring dress? Does he wear overalls in "Pullman cars, hotels, private homes?" Does he appear so shabby and disreputable that anyone would recognize him at a glance as a follower of Roosevelt?

* * *

Of the 6,209 Congregational churches in the United States, 2,573 are listed as "zero" churches. A "zero" church is one that does not report any additions on confession of faith during the year.

We wonder if the figures in this country reveal the same state of affairs.

* * *

Canon Scott Holland in *Commonwealth* once expressed sentiments which will awake a response in many hearts:

How good it would be, now and again, if the chairman of a stuffy committee, which had been getting crosser and crosser every minute, as it passed through item after item of an endless agenda paper, and tempers were fretful, and six rival amendments had all got tangled up in one another, and it began to look as if they would sit there until Domesday—were to rise, and, in a quiet voice, to announce:

I will arise and go now, and go to Innisfree,
And a small cabin build there, of clay and wattles made.

It would give just that wholesome relief: that wider outlook: which were so sorely needed. All the amendments would drop at once to the ground: and we would rush out at once into the open air, and whoop for joy. It would not matter to us in the least what we had, or had not, carried.

* * *

Several topics with which we hoped to deal this quarter must be reserved for fuller treatment in our next issue. Prof. G. M. Trevelyan's *Grey of Fallodon, e.g.*, is so important that it must have fuller treatment than is possible this time. In the next number, too, a glance must be given to the important international Conferences —Faith and Order, Life and Work—to be held in the summer at Edinburgh and Oxford. A distinguished American theologian who has played a great part in œcumenical gathers will deal with the conferences in our pages: British students are already much in Dr. W. Adams Brown's debt, and they will read with interest what he has to say. The pressure on our space, especially on the section devoted to books, leads us to add a sheet of 16 pages this quarter. This must not be taken as a precedent, for it means living beyond our means.

IS GOD AT WORK TO-DAY?

By Prof. C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D.

The question of questions for a religious man to-day is here: What is God doing, or seeking to do, in our bewildered and bewildering times? The question—let us be clear—is not, What *has* God wrought? For no Christian man will hesitate in his answer to *that* question. We believe that God *has* wrought, *has* spoken, *has* expressed Himself, in the unique Person of Jesus whom we call the Christ. Christians may disagree, and may continue to disagree, as to the precise formula in which they would endeavour to give clear and exact definition to their Christological conviction. But what they cannot disagree upon—if they be convinced Christians—is that God *has* revealed His own essential nature in the historic Person of Jesus. His is the name above every other name because it is the name of Him who *knew* God as no one else has ever known Him, and who, therefore, *revealed* Him as no one else has ever done. The Christian conviction is that the revelation of God in Jesus is God's *Self*-revelation. Christ is God's "Word", or—as Goethe in Faust preferred to translate the Fourth Evangelist's "Logos"—God's "Deed". He is, that is, the expression in place and time of the Eternal Mind and Will of the Living God. And it is this conviction which the Church through all the centuries has been seeking to express in her credal statements about Jesus Christ. We find differing emphases in the systems of different Christian thinkers. The Nicene declaration was that He was "very God *of* very God", and that He was "of one substance with the Father". There are many to-day who, while profoundly sympathizing with the dogmatic endeavours of the Church in days gone by, think that the New Testament has said this better than any of the Councils of the Church, or than any of the theologians, whether ancient or modern.

Nevertheless, the *main* question for a Christian man to-day is not there. He is concerned, not just, or primarily, with what God *once* did, but with what He is *now* doing. The prophets of religion have told us of what God spoke to them. "Thus *saith* the Lord" has been the burden of their message—not, let us note, "Thus *hath* said the Lord". That is, they believed in the Living God, who not only had spoken aforetime but was speaking to them in their own day. The revelation which they received was not a kind of mechanical reproduction of what had once been spoken—like, for example, the gramophone records of the utterances of the dead to which we to-day may listen. The revelation given to the prophets was, they believed, the authentic voice of the Living God, and heard by them within the depths of their own consciousness. It was a Voice speaking,

and not a word spoken. In every age this is the conviction of the prophet: and hence his frequent antagonism to the priest, or the priest's antagonism to him. For the priest is chiefly concerned with Divine commands *once* given; the prophet is chiefly concerned with the Divine Voice *now* speaking. It is clear to every student of the Gospels that Jesus was in the line of the prophets. He was concerned, not to lead men back to what God once had said, but to bring them to listen to what God was *now* speaking to them through Himself. "Ye have heard that it hath been said . . . but I say unto you": this was the burden of His message. And what *He* said was, He believed, what *God* was saying to Himself in the unplumbed depths of His own consciousness. The intimate way in which Jesus spoke of God shows conclusively that to Him God was the Living God with whom He was continually in personal communion. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" is one of His utterances, found in the Fourth Gospel. Such an utterance springs out of a direct consciousness of the presence with Him of the living, perpetually-operative God. It was out of His unique fellowship with the Father that there flowed His unique obedience to the Father's will. Fellowship and obedience both bespeak a living relationship. Intimacy and dependence are conjoined in a union which is dynamic, not static. They render impossible, to one who knows such an experience, the notion of God as frozen, timeless Absolute, or as static Being of unalterable immobility.

Thus it is, that to prophets of old, and supremely to Christ—who was prophet and more than prophet—God was not the God who once had spoken and now was silent. Central to the whole message of the Book of Books is the conviction that God is no aloof Artificer of the universe. He is no absentee from His creation, least of all from the sons of men whom He has made "in His image, and after His likeness". In virtue of His own essential nature He cannot but reveal Himself. In virtue of the plenitude and perfection of His *Life,* He cannot but be operative in His universe. There never has been a time when His "Word" has not been spoken; nor can there ever be a time when His Voice will be stilled. There never has been a period of history when His "Deed" has not been active.

His Spirit floweth free,
High surging where it will:
In prophet's word He spake of old,
He speaketh still.
Established is His law,
And changeless it shall stand,
Deep writ upon the human heart,
On sea, on land.

Further, not only is it that all the prophets of old, and supremely Jesus Christ, have told us of a God who was perpetually operative,

Pacific School of Religion

for ever revealing His nature and His will to men: our own hearts and minds cannot be satisfied with any other conception of God. In the last resort, atheism and thorough-going deism are not very far apart. To say that there is no God, and to say that God does nothing, are two ways of saying what to the really religious mind is but one thing. The distinction is one that belongs to the realm of abstract and speculative thought, and not to the moral and spiritual realm in which vital religion has its home. And when I say this I do not mean that speculative thought has not its part to play in that whole activity for which religion stands, nor forget that—as Huxley once said—"Right practice depends on right theory". The practice of a boy who has never known a father—if I may illustrate from the realm of human relationships—is not affected by the theoretical conviction he has that without a father he could not have come into the world. It would only be affected if he were assured by others on the most certain grounds that his father had certain qualities of character. What I would wish to say is that vital religion has its being in the realm of qualities: and qualities in God bespeak life and activity. A God who does nothing will never be missed by humanity. Such a conception will inspire to no good work. Such a God is but a hypothesis to account for a speculative difficulty. The difficulty is this perplexing world in which we find ourselves: the hypothesis is that it did not create itself. For myself, I confess that the Deistic hypothesis very inadequately meets the difficulty. For while it tells us that the world was *created* by a Being we may call "God", it involves the belief that this "God" has *forsaken* what He has created.

No. Our own minds, as well as our own hearts, will refuse this speculative substitute for religion. As a speculative theory, deism will never be a rival to the theism of living religion. Most people, if they had to choose, would rather embrace pantheism than deism. Happily they have not so to choose. The God of Christianity is the *Living* God. If He were not so conceived, religious and thoughtful men could not be Christians. As Hartley Coleridge put it:

> In sacred books we read how God did speak
> To holy men in many different ways;
> But hath the present age no God to seek,
> Or is God silent in these latter days?
>
> The word were but a blank, a hollow sound,
> If He that spake it were not speaking still.

Now if this be so, the question which at once arises is: *How* do we know what God is doing, and *how* do we hear what He is saying? The answer to such a question is not obscure. We can only know what God is doing, hear what He is saying, through the whole mysterious consciousness which He has given to us. What we call

"knowledge" presupposes consciousness. We can know God in no other way but through our consciousness: as, indeed, we can know nothing at all except through our consciousness. Whatever it is we say we "know"—whether it be a loaf of bread or a person, a pair of boots or a symphony, a suit of clothes or the love of a dear friend —we can only make this claim in virtue of a *conscious* response to these—as we call them—"objective realities".

Very often in the past the freedom of thought and the sanctity of private choice and private judgment have been opposed by those who wanted to defend—or shelter behind—a "revelation" once for all given, a deed once for all performed, in the days that are gone. Such defenders often forgot that the "deed", once and for all performed, had to be seen performed by someone, otherwise they themselves would have heard nothing about it: that the "revelation", once and for all given, had to be *received,* or perceived, by someone, otherwise they themselves would never even be trying to defend its "final" character. There is no such thing as an "objective revelation" without the subjective factor of some human consciousness. What we call "revelation" presupposes One who reveals, and one to whom the revelation comes. Without his consciousness, man could say of no-one or of nothing, "Here God reveals Himself to me". God is not revealed to a stone. Mind only reveals itself to mind, consciousness to consciousness. When, therefore, authoritarian thinkers to-day plead for a return to an "objective revelation" or to an "inspired book" or to an "infallible Church", they are by no means escaping the subjective factor of the human consciousness. All they are doing is to confer on the consciousness of some-one, or of some body of men, in the past an insight transcending their own, or a capacity of reception to which they themselves cannot attain. If we ask for an "objective revelation" which has not been subject to the human consciousness as one of its conditioning factors, we know not what we ask. No book ever did, or ever will, write itself: it required the mind of a man or of a number of men to write it; and what was written was but the transmission into visible signs of an invisible reality within the conscious or sub-conscious depths of personalities. Likewise, no institution ever made itself, or was ever made otherwise than through the minds of men. Every institution which we find at present on this planet has had a history; and its history is the story of the activities of human minds—this activity necessarily involving their reaction to the whole hereditary and environing situation. To declare that God is revealed in a Book means, therefore, this: that within the whole conscious and sub-conscious life of the writers of that Book God Himself was revealed. Likewise, to declare that God is revealed in an institution means this: that within the whole mental life of the makers and shapers of that institution the will of God was made known. An institution is an abstraction and has no existence

apart from the minds that fashion it or operate it. The Church can only speak through the voices of its members, or through their writings or their deeds—that is, through the whole mental life of men. I am far from saying that a man always *knows* what he is making; or that an author always *knows* what he is going to write. Institutions often surprise their makers and fashioners. Authors are often astonished when they read what they have written. In each case, men do more than they *consciously* know. Nevertheless, no man is an automaton; nor indeed any body of men. Whatever is made is the expression of mind; whatever is written is the representation of mental life. That in ways beyond our ken our minds can be quickened by the Divine Spirit we believe: nevertheless, that this quickening is conditioned by our own quality of mind, and, especially, by our own fidelity to what we have already known or received we also believe. Man's mind is not a piece of inanimate matter on which are mechanically registered "supernatural" communications. Nothing is "given" which is not "received". There are no magical impartations of mind. "Spirit to spirit Thou dost speak".

It is on this, as we may call it, bilateral process that religion and revelation are based. Clearly, it involves the "immanence" of God within the human spirit; or the kinship of the human consciousness with the Divine Consciousness. Were this not so, man could never even speak of God, nor ever declare, *Thus saith the Lord*. When, through the whole evolutionary process, God created man, the highest gift which He conferred upon him was his consciousness. Indeed, this was the gift in virtue of which man is man. It is in the quality of consciousness that man is differentiated from all other sentient life upon this planet. And, further, it is the quality of consciousness that distinguishes men from men. One man's consciousness may be stunted or impoverished: another's may be growing richer and more complete every day. Implicit in all vital religion, and in the whole bilateral process involved in "revelation", is the conviction that man's consciousness is given him by God in order that he may learn to know the Divine mind; and, thus, in order that he may obediently co-operate with the Divine Purpose. What God does in human life He does through men: what God wills for humanity becomes operative through the consecrated reciprocity of human wills.

What has all this to do with the question from which we started our discussion? Surely this. That if we would know what God is seeking to do in our times, we must scrutinize and seek to understand the depths of our own conscious life. If God is speaking, or seeking to speak, to humanity in these distracted days we must be willing to listen humbly, patiently, faithfully, and eagerly. Unless we are willing to pay the price we shall neither come to know the Divine Will nor learn to make it operative in human life.

We may so easily deceive ourselves in this matter. Chiefly, our self-deception has its spring in our materialism. And this materialism may be a religious materialism as well as a scientific or naturalistic materialism.

As far as religious materialism is concerned, it is seen in the love of "signs and wonders". Men apply the *naïve* realism of their contact with the natural world to spiritual and unseen realities. Because the natural world is perceived by—as we may call it—a certain passivity of mind, they think the spiritual world should be likewise perceived. All that is necessary in order to see a mountain that is there is to open the eyes: all that is necessary to feel a table before us is to stretch forth the hand: all that is necessary to hear the chirping of a bird outside our house is to open the door. Thinking in this *naïvely* realistic way, we imagine that with a similar comparative passivity we should be able to see, to touch, to hear, God. But, since in common human experience we know that not thus can we know God, we delude ourselves by the notion that there was a time in the past when such an experience was possible. We are really asking for a "hand-writing of God on the face of the sky", and, since we do not find what we ask, we like to think of some past age when such a request was granted by God. We then adopt the "authoritarian" attitude of mind, and regard religious knowledge as giving uncritical assent to *naïvely* realistic claims on behalf of a spiritual knowledge of the past. This attitude of mind—it is hardly necessary to add—is fostered in manifold ways and by all kinds of pragmatic or utilitarian considerations and pleas. It is even proclaimed that without a surrender to this "authoritarianism" men must ever be strangers to religious humility. O humility! How many are the pleas made on thy behalf, from the day when Jesus refused humbly to accept what the Sanhedrin told Him, through all the subsequent years.

The submission of the mind to this materialistic authoritarianism is really an escape from the challenge and burden of life as God has appointed it. It involves a failure to see that, when we get back to all external authorities, we find the free human consciousness confronting the challenge of Reality. The origin of all our outward authorities is the insight and the response of the free spirit of a man, or the free spirits of men. The only justification for the perpetuation of such authorities is that they should bear unflinching testimony to the summons of life and to the need that every age should penetrate behind every extrinsic authority to the authority of the inward response to the Living and Operating God. External authorities should be pedagogic, and never coercive. Whenever they seek to function compulsively they surrender the initial insights from which they have sprung.

A tension thus arises in every religious mind, a tension which is

inescapable. Authority and Freedom, Law and Spirit, Reality and Consciousness—these are the twin poles of the religious life. We do not escape that tension—however much we may be tempted by its difficulty so to do—by acquiescence in any externalism. Relief so gained is illusory. In the depths of our minds we know that we have fled life; we have not confronted it. We have made life too easy. We are back in the world of the compulsions of the natural. We assent to what we are told, or to what some dogma seems to say. Like some pacifists who find in the pacifist formula the answer to every problem which may confront them with respect to their future duty in and to the State, we prefer the simplicity of a formula to the complexity of life itself. Duties, however, are not so easily settled, or determined. Dogmas do not save us from the burden of thought. They are part of our problem, not its solution. They should be regarded as proclaiming *principles,* not as dictating *rules*. They belong not to the category of a legal code, but to the order of spiritual truth and moral motive. They are not coercive, but educative. They are meant to illumine the way, not to prescribe a path. They are the embodiments of insights, and have a value for that reason. But we treat them wrongly when we regard them as shrines, or prisons. We regard them rightly when we see that they are monuments of the free, spiritual consciousness of men. We dare not worship a monument: were we to do so, we should be in like case to the idolaters of whom the prophet of the exile spoke: "he maketh a god, even his graven image; he falleth down unto it and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me; for thou art my god". Instead, we bow before the insights which have led to the creation of every monument of truth, of beauty, or of goodness. For it is in these monuments of spiritual consciousness that there has been the meeting-place, the encounters, of the Divine and the human. And when we regard all man's monuments in this way—that is, when we penetrate beyond the form to the spirit that informs—we are delivered from all false servitudes, and all spurious humilities; and take our place in the Kingdom of the free. We are thus emancipated both from our own self-assertions and from enslavement to the coercive assertions of others. In each case, the "assertion" belongs to the kingdom of the world.

Religious apologists are so prone to combat the materialistic attitudes of the sheer naturalists that they often forget to combat an insidious form of the same attitude in the "supernaturalists". It is difficult to say which form presents the greater peril to the Kingdom of the Spirit. Perhaps the latter: for the foes within the household are a more subtle menace than the foes without. It is for that reason that all the prophets of humanity were more concerned with the perversions of religion than with the denials of religion. The corruption of the best is the worst. Thus we understand the prophetic fervour

of Isaiah, of Hosea, of Amos, of Micah, of Jeremiah in the Old Testament. A burden was laid upon them—the burden of the freedom and peremptoriness of their spiritual insight. Thus, too, we understand the prophetic emphasis of Jesus. His friends were many—but few of them came from the upper ranks of the religious institution. How could it be otherwise when He was primarily concerned with the supremacy of the spiritual? How difficult for those who trust in riches—whether the riches represented by money or the riches represented by ecclesiastical traditions and external forms—to enter the Kingdom of heaven! Simple and sincere men heard Him gladly: the worldly-wise religious rulers compassed His death. Those who use the weapons of the world in the interests of traditional religion thereby show conclusively who are their real masters. The method reveals the man.

There are, however, the sheer naturalists. These deny that there is any Kingdom of the Spirit. They have searched the heavens with their telescopes, and have not discovered God. They have probed the human consciousness, and instead of discovering a meeting-place of God and man, they have found all kinds of "complexes". They refuse to believe that spiritual things are spiritually discerned. They, therefore, do not acknowledge the insights of religious vision, and do not listen to the utterances of spiritual experience. Should they be asked, "Is God at work to-day?" they will answer, "He never has been at work".

It is not for us here to seek to answer the sheer negationists. But in the last resort we are driven back—as we were when confronting the religious materialists—upon the depths of our human consciousness, and upon the question of its meaning. That it has some final meaning we do not doubt. And that its meaning is seen in what it is, or may be, we cannot but believe. What it may be we can see in the lives of the prophets; and, supremely, in the life of Jesus the Christ. But we can only *see* this, if our own spirits have been awakened to the reality of things unseen. Not even Jesus can be an "authority" to those who are wholly devoid of spiritual understanding, or spiritual vision. In the country of the blind the man who claims to see must necessarily be treated as deluded. He can never be acknowledged as king; for a king has qualities which are *recognized* by his subjects.

For the cause of our present religious feebleness we must look within ourselves. We have ceased to believe in the Living God. If we did believe we should hearken to what His Spirit is saying to the Churches—that is, to our own deepest consciousness. We are bewildered and distracted. We have so many problems that we do not know where to begin, or what to do. We are nerveless and dispirited. Some cry for a "sign from heaven" to restore their self-confidence.

Jesus once said to the Pharisees and Sadducees who had asked Him to show them a sign from heaven: "When it is evening, ye say, It will be fair weather: for the heaven is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather to-day: for the heaven is red and lowring. Ye know how to discern the face of the heaven; but ye cannot discern the signs of the times". Signs to buttress our materialistic beliefs are not, in the mercy of God, granted to us. In God's universe there are no coercive "signs". Spiritual things are spiritually discerned. The Kingdom of God is not the Kingdom of the "world". Having eyes to see, we see not; and ears to hear, we hear not.

Here, within the present urgent situation, God is speaking. Here, in every challenge presented to our love and quest for truth, for goodness, for beauty, is God at work. We must have faith to *confront* life. When He speaks within, we must listen. It is *His* voice which calls to us to relinquish our materialism of creed and of life. Our obstinate insistence on the externalities of tradition and custom will not avail us. We must cease to move on the surface of things. We must dare to go deeper into our consciousness. And we must go, without the materialism of so many modern negationists who delude themselves into thinking that to "explain away" is to "explain".

The supreme need of our times is a real belief in the Living God. Nothing will ever be right without it. We shall never see the needs of our fellow men rightly without it. We shall never see our own needs without it. Without the assurance of the Living God, we shall continue nerveless, bewildered, impotently worried, without vision and without hope.

The revelation of God is in man, and to man. "The heavens declare His glory"—but only to those who have eyes to see.

> Not where the wheeling systems darken,
> And our benumbed conceiving soars;
> The drift of pinions—would we hearken—
> Beats at our own clay-shuttered doors.

THE STRUCTURAL UNIT OF NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

By the Rev. Lewis Johnson.

The purpose of this article is to illustrate certain features of the *N.T.* writings revealed by stichometrical calculations, and to indicate some important conclusions to be drawn from them.

That ancient prose writings were founded upon a unit called the στίχος may, I suppose, be taken as certain. Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* says: "The Greeks and Romans measured the contents of their MSS. by lines, not merely in poetry, but also artificially in prose for a standard line of fifteen or sixteen syllables, called by the earliest writers ἔπος, afterwards στίχος". And Dr. Rendel Harris has discussed the problem in detail in his monograph *Stichometry*, and in *New Testament Autographs*. He shows that the στίχος was a line equivalent in length to the hexameter. In discussing whether the line was measured by letters or by syllables he indicates the likelihood of a primitive letter-measurement changing in course of time to a syllabic measurement. His own conclusion is that the στίχος of the *N.T.* period was measured by syllables. However, he quotes Michaelis to this effect: "Στίχοι were only lines which contained a certain number of letters, and therefore often broke off in the middle of a word".

The στίχος, then, was apparently a line of prose equivalent in length to the verse-hexameter, *i.e.*, a norm of 16 syllables or 36 letters. On either reckoning it is a unit of definite length, but on the letter-reckoning it would be most precise: there could be no variation in the length of lines at all, save the almost infinitesimal difference due to the varying breadth of individual letters, since there was no spacing between the words.

On the face of it, it would seem far more natural to suppose that, while verse was of necessity founded on a syllabic basis, prose lines would be written on a letter-basis. If a prose writer began to think of his lines in syllables he would surely *tend* to shape hexameters. And the analysis I have made of the *N.T.* books (and others) leads me to predicate the great probability of a letter-measurement for the στίχος in regard to them. I wish, therefore, to put forward the hypothesis of a 36-letter line as the basis of *N.T.* writings, and to show by a few illustrations how the hypothesis works out.

The columns of writing on a scroll would presumably have a regular number of στίχοι per column. Now a quite striking feature of the *N.T.* books (it is even apparent to readers of the English translation) is the frequent occurrence of self-contained paragraphs

identical in size. (The unit is represented by about 27½ lines in Nestle's Greek text, or some 23-24 lines in Westcott-Hort.) On analysis such paragraphs are all found to hover around a norm of one thousand letters—strictly 1008 letters, 28 *στίχοι* of 36 letters each.

As the evidence of such "pages" accumulated I was led to the hypothesis that the *N.T.* books might be composed on the basis of a series of such self-contained units; in other words, that they were composed column by column, each one a distinct entity, a complete paragraph, almost as one would set out to write a sonnet sequence. To us, with our modern habit of flowing script that is heedless of the precise page-divisions into which the printed copy will fall, such a theory may at first glance seem preposterous. But it is arguable that writing was a much more deliberate work in earlier times. And it would not be difficult for a man to shape his pages on his wax-tablets till he had them ready for transcription to papyrus or parchment roll. However that may be, the further my research has gone the more evidence has accumulated of the undeniable occurrence of this unit, both in the *N.T.* books, throughout the writings of Josephus, and elsewhere—an occurrence very difficult to explain, I think, as merely accidental.

Moreover, a further fact comes to light. In all the larger books the material seems clearly to fall into blocks of ten of these units, or "pages" as I will call them. According to my analysis *Mk.* has 50 pages (but nearly one-third of the final page is missing); *Lk.* has 90, in three clear divisions of 30 each; and *Acts* appears almost certainly to be an exact replica, in its formation, of the Gospel, but there are some pages missing at the end. *Matt.* appears to have 80 pages; *Jn.* 60 (apart from the appendix of c. 21); the *Apocalypse* 40; *Rom.* 30; and so on. Josephus's *Jewish War* has seven books identical in size with Luke's books (the present book-divisions, though seven in number, are irregular and all astray). Whether these blocks of ten columns have any relationship to the size of a *scapus* or strip of papyrus is, perhaps, worth investigation.

But my purpose here is simply to illustrate by a few examples the apparent evidence yielded by the *N.T.* books for a structural unit such as I have envisaged. I will take four or five different types of evidence in succession, and give a few examples of the sort of thing one finds.

(1) Here, first, are some examples of my standard "page", lying practically perfect in the text of our present Greek Testament. (My enumerations refer throughout to Nestle's Stuttgart edition 1898, which has been the basis for my calculations: its variations from Westcott-Hort are generally inconsiderable, and I have always had the latter in comparison with it, as well as Scrivener's edition, which, I believe, quite frequently includes better readings than those of the

more modern editions.) By describing a page as "practically perfect" I mean that it comes anyhow within a very few letters of the exact norm of 1008, and is easily adjusted to this exact norm by the adoption of *quite likely extant* variants.

Take first a few examples from *Mk.*: 2^{1-12} is a clear self-contained section with 1005 letters in Nestle's text. Similarly 8^{1-13} has 998 letters, with the highly probable addition of *οἱ φαγόντες* in v. 9 omitted by Nestle; 8^{14-26}, again, has 994 letters, but in the uncertain last clause Nestle adopts an abbreviated and, I think, inherently improbable variant; 10^{17-27} is another example with 999 letters in Nestle; 12^{1-12}, with 1010 letters; 12^{28-37} with 1006; 14^{40-50} with 1012. And here is a particularly striking fact. It was only after I had completed my analysis of the Gospel that as a mere after-thought it occurred to me to tot up the letters of the editorial appendix 16^{9-20}, with this result: in Nestle it stands at 985 letters, but Nestle omits 8 letters in v. 14, and 15 letters in v. 18, which are included in W.-H. On the other hand, W.-H. stands at 998 letters, but omits 10 letters in v. 17 that are included by Nestle. That is arresting. The editor, I suggest, has not attempted to complete the broken page at the end of *Mk.*, but has merely added a fresh page of *precisely the size assumed* in my analysis of the Gospel. That seems to me strong evidence in favour of the *normality* of composition on the basis of this structural unit.

A few clear examples of the "page" in *Matt.* are: 9^{9-17} (1005); 15^{1-14} (1012); 15^{29-39} (1003); 22^{15-28} (998). In *Lk.*: 2^{40-52} (1017); 4^{1-13} (991); 5^{1-11} (993); 6^{1-11} (1016); 6^{24-35} (1008); 13^{23-33} (1018); 10^{1-12} (992); 20^{20-33} (1008); 23^{26-38} (1007). Similar examples might be multiplied from other books. There are plenty of them in the Epistles, where I had no expectation at first that this pagination would be likely to hold good, since one would suppose their composition to be more casual. But it seems to work out very clearly. One outstanding example of the unit is the famous Praise of Charity *1 Cor.* 12^{31b}-13 (including the opening phrase of 14^{1} *διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην*).

But though there are very many more of these perfect examples of the page-unit standing clear in our present text than can, I believe, be reasonably accounted for on the theory of accidental coincidence, they only form one fraction of the evidence supporting my hypothesis.

(2) I will turn now to another group of sections which have this common feature: that they are all marked by some disputed clause; and the adoption or rejection of the clause, as the case may be, at once yields the perfect page.

Take *e.g. Matt.* 19^{27}-20^{7}. Nestle, in common with W.-H., omits from v. 7 the closing phrase *καὶ ὃ ἐὰν ᾖ δίκαιον λήμψεσθε* ("and whatsoever is right ye shall receive"), which is included by Scrivener and the older texts. But the section in Nestle stands at 985 letters, and

the omitted clause adds precisely the 23 more required to bring the page to the exact norm. The clause is intrinsically probable, and its genuineness would seem to be proven if the page-unit is a true guide.

Another example from *Matt.* is $27^{27\text{-}38}$ where the restoration of the deleted quotation in v. 35 is needed to complete the page.

Similarly in *Mk.* 14^{66}-15^{5} we have to add in v. 3 the clause *αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο*—again an inherently probable clause, though rejected by Nestle and W.-H.

In *Lk.* $9^{51\text{-}62}$ we have a very clear section which, however, in Nestle's text has only 970 letters, and therefore demands the restoration of the rejected clause in v. 55—*καὶ εἶπεν οὐκ οἴδατε οἵου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς* ("and said Ye know not what spirit ye are of").

In *Lk.* $23^{26\text{-}38}$ it is notable that we have assuredly to include the "Father, forgive them, *etc.*" of v. 34, which W.-H. bracket as doubtful.

In *Rom.* 10^{16}-11^{6} the acceptance of the clause in v. 6 *εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων οὐκέτι ἐστὶν χάρις, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκ ἐστὶν ἔργον*, rejected alike by Nestle and W.-H., just fills the lacuna to make a perfect page. So again in *Rom.* $16^{3\text{-}16}$, where the removal of the uncertain clause in 5a—*καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν*—leaves an exact 1008-letter page.

(3) I pass on to illustrate a third group of cases where the removal of what I think may be said to be a palpable gloss at once brings us face to face with the correct page, *e.g. Mk.* $9^{38\text{-}50}$ stands at 1029 letters. The superfluous 21 are exactly the sorry remnant of v. 49 still retained in our modern editions—*πᾶς γαρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται*—a meaningless phrase which has no real link with the context, and is explicable only as a confused marginal gloss.

Or take the parable of the wedding-guests in *Matt.* $22^{1\text{-}14}$. Surely the authenticity of v. 13 is suspect on the face of it. The story of the parable concerns an earthly king and his guests at a feast. How can such a king command his servants to cast an offender into "outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth"—a customary description of Gehenna? One need not comment on the extravagant revengefulness of the penalty; the clinching point is that it does not fit the story. It has all the appearance of a clumsy amplification by someone who wished to rub home the moral, and who confuses the action of the earthly king with his private supposition of what the parable intended to indicate as to the action of God. Now this section stands in Nestle at 1130 letters. But Nestle omits the quite likely *ἀκούσας* at the start of v. 7; also we may well read the variant *ὅσους* for *οὕς* in v. 10. We should then have a redundancy of 131 letters, and these are exactly accounted for by the intrusive gloss of v. 13. One might add scores of other similar examples where some foolish gloss has twisted or obscured the significance of a passage,

and its removal gives us the stichometrically correct page: the phrase about "weeping and gnashing of teeth" occurs several times in *Matt.*, and is on every occasion a gloss. So in *Jn.* 6 the reiterated phrase "I will raise him up at the last day" (expressing a thought quite alien to the real argument) occurs four times over, and is on every occasion a gloss. But I will avoid discussing points with any theological implication, and turn to one or two very simple instances of gloss. *Acts* $5^{19\text{-}28}$ is an apparent "page"; but the clause in v. 26 ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαὸν ("for they feared the people") comes in with an awkward jerk, and looks to be quite probably a gloss. Well, its removal leaves us, as one would expect, face to face with the precise 1008 letters. Similarly in $8^{18\text{-}28}$ the deletion of the fairly obvious marginal note in v. 26 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος ("this is desert") leaves us with the exact page. Also on the immediately following page the deletion of the, to my mind, clearly intrusive clause "Now Philip was found at Azotus" in v. 40 gives at once the exact page. Again in *Acts* $27^{21\text{-}32}$ the deletion of the very dubious-sounding v. 26 is necessary for the correct page; and in $28^{11\text{-}20}$ we have a redundancy of 16 letters, surely represented by the clause καὶ τριῶν ταβερνῶν in v. 15. It seems inconceivable that *Lk.* should thus duplicate the name of the place. It would be like a traveller recording that he went to Hawaii *and* the Sandwich Islands. But it is explicable enough that an alternative colloquial name should be jotted in the margin by someone familiar with the spot, and thence incorporated into the text.

One or two final references must suffice for my present purpose: *Jn.* $7^{14\text{-}27}$ at once falls to shape as soon as we eliminate the clause which enters so awkwardly into v. 22—"not that it is from Moses but from the fathers". *Gal.* $4^{17\text{-}31}$ is correct as soon as we delete from v. 25 the clause "Mount Sinai is in Arabia"—a mere geographical marginal note which has been confusedly foisted into the text. *I Cor.* 8 is a perfect page if we delete v. 3, which is quite out of place and uncalled for, but explicable enough as a marginal jotting. And in *I Cor.* $11^{2\text{-}16}$, v. 10 is a glaring gloss, interrupting the context, and expressive of a superstition unlikely, one hopes, to have been entertained by St. Paul, although I believe it is traceable in the Talmud—the notion that "spirits" enter a woman's head through the ear. Its removal gives the correct page.

In view of the plentifulness of supposed glosses that this hypothesis indicates—and I believe the *N.T.* writings are far more heavily glossed than we have had hitherto any means of detecting other than the shrewd surmises of commonsense—it may be worth while to call attention here to a small point which, I think, demonstrates beyond cavil how easily and frequently glossing *was* introduced into the text. Let any reader open his Westcott-Hort on the very first page, which contains the beginning of the genealogy of Jesus. W.-H. arranges this genealogical table, as I believe the original autograph

did, with each generation occupying a separate short line. When thus arranged the glosses at the end of certain lines hit the eye immediately—phrases like *καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς Ῥούθ, τὸν βασιλέα, etc.*, which are not integral parts of the genealogy at all, but mere marginal notes. We happen to *see* these little glosses quite clearly because of the unusual shape of the page with its abbreviated lines. But that the same sort of thing happened everywhere else, though not visually apparent, is, I think, arguable from the very first line of this page. The page starts off with a perfect *στίχος* of 36 letters, glossed by the addition of *νἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ*. That phrase is not a *title* for our Lord like *νἱοῦ Δανεὶδ*. It is never so used. But in view of the fact that this genealogy traces His descent from Abraham it is not very surprising that someone should add this little gloss to the first line, as other glosses were added below. It is, I judge, just as certainly gloss as, *e.g.*, *ἐκ τῆς Ῥούθ*, and the special visibility of the latter is merely due to the unusual arrangement of the column, not in full *στίχοι*, but in shorter lines. I will also note in passing that after the opening *στίχος* there follow 27 steps in the genealogy down to v. 11, which would bring us to the foot of the first column in *Matt.'s* autograph. And it is just here, at bottom of page, that we get the more extended gloss—"and his brethren, at the time of the carrying away into Babylon", with a corresponding gloss at the top of the second column : "and after the carrying off into Babylon". This, so far forth, may point to the correctness of my assumption of the 28-line column as the structural unit. But what I am mainly concerned with here is to emphasize the fact that on the very first page of *Matt.* there are no less than eight distinct glosses; small and unimportant, indeed, but there they are. And if the first page of the *N.T.* has thus been peppered with them it would be amazing if there were not a plentiful sprinkling of them elsewhere.

(4) I will now pass on to give a few examples of restored dislocations which the stichometrical analysis makes possible. The evidence from this source gives, as it seems to me, extremely powerful support to the theory of pagination that I am suggesting. Certain dislocations in the *N.T.* text are notorious, *e.g.*, *John* 14. But any careful reader is disconcerted again and again by bad logical connexions or jerky transitions in the narrative, and a general sense of shapelessness in some parts of the *N.T.* books. And this, I am convinced, is mainly, if not altogether, due to the deplorable amount of disarrangement which has taken place. Can anyone doubt the presence of disorder *e.g.* in *Jn.* 7-8 or *2 Cor.* 8-9, or *Rev.* 9? Can anyone doubt that *Matt.* 23 is out of place—its closing verse is impossible *after* the arrival in Jerusalem. There are any amount of such confusions. Luke's writings show much evidence of delightful artistry, yet much of the middle part of his Gospel is contemptibly

chaotic composition, *as we now have it.* I believe it is possible to restore the *N.T.* books to their proper logical sequences by means of this key of the pagination; and when thus restored they show admirable dexterity of design and perfect lucidity. Their present shape—it is hardly too much to say—is often no more than the mangled remains of what were really very deftly constructed works, with a fine sense of architectonic proportion. As regards the Synoptic Gospels I fancy that a good deal of the dislocation has been due to effort to assimilate them one to another. Hence most of *Lk.'s* new material has been thrown almost higgledy-piggledy into the centre of his book, as if a copyist had as far as possible assimilated his earlier chapters with *Mk.*, and also his final chapters, and then thrown together what was left over: *e.g.*, 13^{10-21} in its whole tone and texture seems to belong with 6^{1-11}, and the restored structure shows that it does belong there. Also $9^{51ff.}$ stands far too early in the narrative in its present position. And so forth. But since dislocations are just as frequent in *Jn.* and elsewhere we should have to seek explanation for them on other grounds as well. That is a problem I cannot here touch upon. My purpose here is but to give two or three examples of the way in which it seems possible to restore to their true context passages that have assuredly got astray, however the disarrangement may have come about. Here is one: *Jn.* 10^{22-23}. These verses are quite puzzling as they stand. In the midst of a discourse about the Shepherd and Sheep, apparently taking place at the time of Feast of Tabernacles (as in cc. 7-8) we are suddenly jerked forward several months to the Feast of Dedication. Yet immediately afterwards the theme of Shepherd and Sheep is resumed. Surely there has been some dislocation. These verses 10^{22-23} would form a very fitting introduction to the whole section cc. 9-10, however, linking these chapters to the Feast of Dedication just as 7-8 are linked to Tabernacles. And the analysis shows that they are needed along with 9^{1-12} to make a proper page. I believe, therefore, that their true position is at the head of c. 9.

Another example of dislocation in *Jn.* is 3^{14-21}, which finds its true context precedent to 12^{34-36}. It is apparently the intrusion of the gloss 12^{33} which has caused the displacement, since it interrupted the Lord's discourse which really runs on uninterruptedly from 12^{23-32} to 3^{14-21}. Notice the accurate link between 3^{14} and 12^{34}—the *Son of Man* must be lifted up; whereas 12^{34} does not *accurately* link on to 12^{32}.

Here, again, is another Johannine restoration which seems to me very convincing: 4^{43-44} has something obviously wrong with it. It reads: "Now after two days he went forth thence into Galilee, for Jesus himself said that a prophet had no honour in his own country". It is impossible to make any sense of that. But now, suppose we insert between 4^{43-44} the paragraph 2^{1-12}. Then we read thus: "Now

after two days he went forth thence into Galilee. And on the third day there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee, *etc.*" Then, following the Cana story, comes the sentence: "After this he went down to Capernaum, he and his mother and brethren and disciples; and he stayed there not many days, for Jesus himself said that a prophet had no honour in his own country". Everything now reads quite clearly and logically. And as regards the stichometry: long before I had perceived the possibility and justice of this connexion I had felt pretty sure that the absurd and intrusive clause in 2^{9} "but the servants which drew the water knew"—the intrusion of which had necessitated the clumsy repetition of ὁ ἀρχιτρίκλινος—was an interpolation. Well, the deletion of these words brings us at once to 1010 letters, and the odd two are accounted for by a tiny variant in 2^{1}*. (It may prevent puzzlement if I mention that the page thus arranged 4^{43}, 2^{1-12}, 4^{44}, does *not*, in the proper order, have 4^{45-54} following after it: that is clearly out of the question. The determination of the order of the opening chapters of *Jn.* is a very ticklish problem, which would occupy far too much space to discuss here.)

Now to take an example from *Lk.* We have the notorious difficulty in c. 4 of v. 31 "to Capernaum, a *city of Galilee*" impossibly *following* v. 23. It is incredible that a careful artist like Luke should write so. I think he did not write so. What he wrote was in this order: $4^{14-15,\ 31-41}$; $4^{42-43,\ 16-19}$; $4^{24-30,\ 44}$ with 5^{12-16}. The visit to Nazareth is *after* the opening incidents in Capernaum and elsewhere.

And here is one striking example of dislocation in *Acts*. The opening of c. 8 is undeniably confused—v. 2 being clearly out of place: it should immediately follow the opening sentence of v. 1, and together these belong with the story of c. 7. We are then left with $8^{1b,\ 3-4}$. Then follow the Philip episodes, which shape into three clear pages thus: $8^{5-17;\ 18-28;\ 29-40}$. Then arriving at c. 9 one finds that vv. 10-20, and 21-30 form good clear pages; but vv. 1-9 are left as as incomplete page. If, however, we place them in conjunction with $8^{1b,\ 3-4}$ we get a page of 979 letters—29 letters short of the norm; and these 29 letters are precisely supplied by the phrase in 9^{5} which both Nestle and W.-H. have rejected—σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν ("it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks"). The authenticity of this clause would thus seem to be demonstrated, if the page-hypothesis be a true key.

Finally, I will draw attention to an unusual displacement in the Epistles. The last chapter of *Rom.* is very difficult as it stands. Not only is the long list of greetings in vv. 3-16 very strange in a letter to a city which Paul had never visited, but he seems to end his letter at v. 16, and then break into further exhortation in 17-20, and then

* Long after I had arrived at this conclusion I found that Hoernle in his *The Record of The Loved Disciple* had, while working from an entirely different point of view, reached the same conviction as to the proper juxtaposition of 21^{1-11} with 4^{43}. He does not, however, proceed to notice the sequence of 4^{44} upon 2^{12}.

resume his greetings and wind up the letter a second time. It is all clumsy and unnatural. I believe the explanation to be that vv. 3-20 do not belong here at all. C. 15^{30}-16^{2} link up with 16^{21-27} to make a perfect page; and this is the thirtieth and concluding page of the Roman epistle. The rest of this c. 16 belongs, I venture to assert, to that third Corinthian letter which has got mixed up with the second to form our chaotic *2 Cor.* *Rom.* 16^{17-20} makes a perfect page along with *2 Cor.* 6^{14}-7^{1} (otherwise left as an unconnected fragment), and *Rom.* 16^{3-16} follows to wind up the letter. The long list of greetings is entirely comprehensible if directed to *Corinth.* And note in *Rom.* 16^{19} "your obedience is come abroad to all men"—very appropriate to the change of heart at Corinth after the second "stern" letter, and in accord with the psychological atmosphere of the third letter of reconciliation. But to a Roman audience it has no traceable point at all.

These illustrations may, perhaps, suffice to show the way in which the true order and structure of the *N.T.* books may be, as I believe, restored by means of this key of the pagination. Similar illustrations could be provided by the score: the above are but glimpses of the process. In its full application it is extraordinarily illuminating. And by its means I believe that certain important interpolations can be definitely detected and excluded.

That there was bad mishandling of *N.T.* writings in the second century (before they came to be regarded as "scripture", and brought together in the canon) is evident from such a quotation as Nestle makes in his *Textual Criticism of the Greek Testament* (p. 199), where he tells how in the year 170 A.D. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, is writing to the Bishop of Rome. The latter has expressed surprise that the Gospels had been "falsified by omissions and additions". And Dionysius replies that his own letters had had a similar fate, "which is not surprising if even to writings of the Lord the same thing had been done". A few omissions or interpolations would soon obliterate the original *shape* of the books, and accidental mistakes in transcription would complete the process. Sir F. Kenyon notes that in periods of persecution it was official copies of scripture preserved in churches which would most likely be destroyed; private copies would escape more easily. And "it was inevitable that the scriptures should be much corrupted during these early centuries when . . . . copies made by private individuals for their own use played an important part in the textual tradition". Private copies were extremely likely to be annotated copies. That helps us to understand a good deal of the glossing with which the *N.T.* books are liberally bespattered. Also there is this to be remembered: since the columns on a scroll were not numbered like our book-pages, if the scroll were torn (or even conceivably cut up to pack away for safety's sake) it would be very easy for the separated fragments to

get out of order. And one confusion would lead to another.

But the question may well be put: is there any external evidence for this hypothetical page? Unfortunately the paleographical evidence for writings round about the first century is, I understand, very scanty. And no first century autographs are extant. Two of the best early MSS. in British Museum—one belonging to the second century B.C. and the other to first century A.D.—are said to have 28 lines to the column, but they are short lines of irregular length, averaging about 16 letters, or less than half a *στίχος*. The fashion of narrower columns came to prevail, as the great Codices show, though the Codex Bezae has, I believe, lines up to 36 letters in length. There are, however, some features of the great Codices which are curious, and which may point back to a common derivation from the groundwork of a traditional 28 × 36 line-page. This is but a surmise, and too intricate for discussion here. The external evidence may be said, at present, to be practically nil. My argument is entirely based on the internal evidence of the writings themselves. And I believe a new and very fruitful line of research is opened up for *N.T.* criticism by this stichometrical test. For anything like *demonstration* one would need to exhibit not one, but several books, in complete analysis. This article does but seek to draw attention to a line of inquiry which may lead to results of singular importance.

CONCERNING THE PAID MINISTRY.

By the Rev. H. E. Berry, M.A.

[*This article is submitted with great diffidence. It deals not with questions of mere academic interest, but with a subject which touches the life-work of men and women who feel called to a sacred office, and one naturally questions one's right to air views on such a subject. At the same time, the article raises issues which the writer believes will have to be faced sooner or later, and someone must make a beginning.*

It is obvious that the argument is very one-sided. It is assumed that all that can be said in favour of a paid ministry is already familiar to the reader, and so no attempt is made to state that side of the case here. That there are many weaknesses and inconsistencies in the article is readily acknowledged. Its main object is to state a concern which the writer believes to be shared by many. If the case is badly put, a better presentation of it will be welcomed. If there are conclusive answers to the questions raised, no one will be more glad to hear them than the writer.]

I. As at the First.

"When Jesus has made his decision that the only way to establish the Kingdom of Heaven is to start with man as man, he immediately turns away from all those classes of people whose importance in their own eyes and in the eyes of others is derived from the institutions of their society". (John Macmurray, *Creative Society*.)

I have always been impressed by the fact that the greatest figures of the Bible were of the non-official, non-professional kind. Most of the great prophets were men who stood apart from the official religious representatives of their day, and frequently subjected them to withering criticism. Amos took care to make it known that he did not belong to the official school of the prophets, but spoke as an ordinary man to whom God had given a message. "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was an herdman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit; and the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy to my people". There is a marked contrast between the utterances of those who had an official position to maintain, and the speech of those plain, blunt men who had no professional status to consider and were answerable to no one but God.

And the same non-professional note is found in the ministry of Jesus. He stands in sharp contrast to the Scribe and Pharisee, to the Priest and Levite. We always think of Him as the Carpenter and of His most intimate followers as fishermen. None of them owes anything to any official rank.

And though Paul had been trained as a Pharisee, in his Christian days he always seemed to be trying to live it down. It was one of the things which had been gain to him but which he counted loss for Christ's sake. It was perfectly natural that he should be employed

as a tent-maker while engaged on his missionary work. And while establishing his right to maintenance as a Christian minister, he claims that his greatest reward is to preach the Gospel without charge.

Altogether, there is a general impression left by both the Old Testament and the New that the kind of religion they have to offer is best understood and expounded by those who come to it from the ranks of the workers.

To use convenient terminology, the Word of God came invariably through the mouth of those who were "amateurs" rather than "professionals", that is to say, through men who had no institution to maintain, no official traditions and prestige to consider, and no pecuniary considerations to influence them. The difference between the two was sensed by the people in our Lord's time when they said that He spoke with authority and not as the scribes.

II. The Menace of Institutionalism.

"The religion of imposing edifices is a heart-breaking affair. It is the soul's cast-off shell. A religion which builds men rather than temples is much to be preferred". (Kagawa.)

" . . . . . we have soft pedalled the Christian doctrine of regeneration, filled our churches with people who are strangers to the deeper movements of the Spirit of God, and have even intrusted the leadership of the Church to men who think of the Church simply as an organization aimed at purely social and practical ends, who judge the 'success' of a given church to be in proportion to its 'busyness' with a thousand and one things of chiefly secular import, and who think that membership on a general committee of some sort is a form of Christian saintship." (Edwin Lewis, *A Christian Manifesto.*)

The Church in every age suffers from the menace of institutionalism. That menace is accentuated by the existence of a professional ministry. Illustrations could be drawn from history, but let us confine ourselves to the present time.

For many people, Christianity has become an institution to be supported, and that institution is focused in the ministry. The majority of church members express their loyalty in terms of the Church rather than in terms of Christ. They will tell you that they love the Church and will do anything to support the Church (which incidentally means, in the main, helping to raise the minister's salary). But if you ask them if they love Christ and if they will do anything for Christ, then they become inarticulate and embarrassed. Loyalty to the institution has taken the place of loyalty to Christ, and the maintenance of organizations has become the equivalent of doing the work of the Kingdom.

And this process has become easier because the responsibility for the worship and witness of the Church can be delegated to an official representative. The essential thing for a large number of churchgoers is that a man should stand up in a pulpit and pray and preach

twice every Sunday. If they provide the support necessary to make this possible, then they think that the requirements of religion are fulfilled and their obligations carried out.

Church members must be made to realize that their part in church life is something more than to be merely passive recipients of sermons. They need to be disabused of the idea that the specifically spiritual work of the church can be delegated to one man because he happens to have been to college.

I feel that the abandonment of a paid ministry would help to get rid of the notion that a minister's work is different *in kind* from that of the ordinary church member. It would help to make clear that the basis of church-membership is not merely "joining" something, but being willing to share in the fellowship and witness of the Church. The conception of the Church as an institution which people join and "support" as they would a hospital or a debating society, must go. The church should be not only a place where services and meetings are held, but a fellowship of dynamic Christians, who having found God in Christ desire to deepen and pass on that experience. It is true that there are diversities of gifts, but that does not abrogate in any way the responsibility which each one shares for the evangelizing activities of the church. Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets!

III. The Menace of Officialism.

"If I know your sect, I anticipate your argument. I hear a preacher announce for his text and topic the expediency of one of the institutions of his church. Do I not know beforehand that not possibly can he say a new or spontaneous word? Do I not know that with all his ostentation of examining the grounds of his institution, he will do no such thing? Do I not know that he is pledged to himself not to look but at one side, the permitted side, not as a man, but as a parish minister? He is a retained attorney, and these airs of the bench are the emptiest affectation. Well, most men have bound their eyes with one or another handkerchief, and attached themselves to some one of these communities of opinion". (Emerson.)

Those in official positions are bound to suffer disadvantages from the point of view of freedom of speech and action. The minister must never forget that he occupies a representative position. He speaks not only as an individual, but as the representative of an ecclesiastical body, and for that reason does not feel as free to act and express himself as he would do in a private capacity. His official position places upon him the responsibility of upholding the traditions and prestige of his own order, and involves a certain conformity to established forms and conventions.

Does not this explain why the public utterances of bishops and men in similar positions on important questions are usually so innocuous and equivocal? They have to remember that what they

say is invested with the authority derived from their rank and office and that anything said by them which challenged the accepted order or which was contrary to the canons of their body would have a very disturbing effect upon the community.

Dr. "Dick" Sheppard in *The Impatience of a Parson* quotes James Bryce on the needful qualifications of the Primate of all England, as follows:

> By the time of Queen Victoria the possession of piety and gifts of speech had become more important qualifications, but the main thing was tactful moderation . . . . The position which the Archbishop of Canterbury holds as the representative in Parliament of the whole established Church makes statesmanship the most important of all qualifications.

This moves Dr. Sheppard to ask:

> Does anyone but the most unblushing Erastian believe that this is what these days require? The old diplomacy has been tried and found wanting in Church and State alike. After all, Pentecost is normal Christianity, and a Church that does everything in "minuet time" is subnormal and anæmic. The ecclesiastical moderator is not adequate nowadays; a constructive revolutionary might be. When the great leader comes to Anglicanism, pandemonium will surely endure for a night, but the morning will be full of promise though he and we may not live to see it.

This is bravely spoken, but does not that for which Dr. Sheppard asks involve the abandonment of the restraints and presuppositions of official status? The word he wants to hear must come from an Amos, not from one of the sons of the prophets.

There is no need to enlarge on the pitfalls of officialism. But is there not ground for saying that since a large proportion of the work of the ministry is of necessity a routine which we are paid to follow, it needs exceptional grace to avoid becoming perfunctory and formal? To have to perform sacred offices because we are paid; to have to preach at stated times because we are paid; to have to do all the things that are expected of one in our position, is not conducive to spontaneity and independence of speech and judgment and action. And there is always the danger lest the most sacred of all callings should become a mere round of duties, lacking the joy of discovery and growing experience. Just as men paid to show people round a great cathedral may grow so familiar with the sight and so accustomed to the story they have to tell that they lose all the thrill and wonder which the beauty of the building first gave them, so the minister may become the victim of routine and familiarity, and lose the sense of the glory of his own message.

These problems may not be solved even by the abolition of a paid ministry. That there are those whose spiritual resources have enabled them to avoid the temptations mentioned is gladly acknowledged.

But the question is here raised, whether the dangers summed up in the word "officialism" are not inherent in the paid ministry, and whether the work of the Kingdom would not be carried on more effectively without it.

IV. Economic Dependence.

"And my reward? This, that I can preach the gospel free of charge, that I can refrain from insisting on my rights as a preacher of the gospel". (*I Cor.* 9[18], Moffatt.)

"However it might be the duty of some, as it may be now, to set themselves entirely at liberty to serve the Gospel, it is in the main a wholesome condition of things when the ministers and officers of the Church share in the common lot of labour. Who should be so well able to counsel and sympathize with their brethren as those who are themselves bearing the same burdens? And whilst the necessities of those who dispense spiritual things should be ungrudgingly supplied, it should be the glory of the Church, as it would be one of her mightiest weapons in her warfare against the world, freely to give what she has so freely received. It is worth almost any sacrifice to preserve the Christian Ministry in all its offices from ever being appraised at a money value or brought down to the level of a trade." (Backhouse and Tylor, *Early Church History*, 78.)

Much might be said about the undesirability of having men paid to preach the Gospel. The economic dependence of ministers on their congregation is bound to put them in an invidious and embarrassing position. It is inevitable that, however unmercenary and pure-motived the minister may be, the desirability of having large congregations and generous supporters who will make light the burden of church finance will appeal very strongly. Naturally the minister feels very much the onus of making the church pay its way. Its financial position reflects on him, even though nothing be said to that effect. And that puts a weapon in the hands of disgruntled and often unspiritual men who dislike the message and personality of the minister and have it in their power to affect the finances adversely. I am far from suggesting that the men in our ministry generally are the kind to yield to economic pressure. But the knowledge that he is ministering to people whose contributions make possible the payment of his salary, and whose attendance and support add to the prestige and prosperity of the church, is bound to affect, even though subconsciously, the minister's approach to his work. His diplomacy and tact must be exercised to the full to prevent certain members from being offended. And there is always the temptation, heroically fought and seldom succumbed to, one hopes, to avoid saying things that will alienate the influential.

At any rate, it is safe to say that every minister would be in a much stronger position, would be much less sensitive to the susceptibilities of the reactionary and the aggrieved, if he were economically independent of his flock, and were also relieved of the onus of making the church a financial success.

Allied with this is the difficult question of whether a paid ministry is in the interests of truth and intellectual freedom. It is an uncomfortable question, but it must be faced. Put plainly it is this. The minister is appointed to preach a gospel which involves certain theological and doctrinal presuppositions. It is true that there are no heresy hunts to-day, and men in the ministry have a greater intellectual freedom than ever before. But the fact remains that there is a sort of minimum of orthodoxy to which a minister is expected to subscribe, even though it never takes the form of a creed. And if for any reason a man comes to feel that he has honest reservations about one or other of the recognized basic theological doctrines of the Christian Church, he should be free to say so, and if necessary to relinquish his position. But here again is it not understandable that in view of the serious consequences involved for himself and his family, a man with misgivings about his theological position might well hesitate to probe his theological orthodoxy too far and be tempted to assume a conviction which he did not feel?

I do not want for one moment to impugn the sincerity of my brethren. This is not an accusation, but the statement of a difficulty. The point is simply this, that in the interests of intellectual honesty and freedom of thought, a man's livelihood should not depend upon his profession of certain beliefs. The fact that the majority of men in the ministry, if not all, believe what they do irrespective of their professional status, does not alter the case. A man ought to be free to form his convictions without having to consider financial and economic consequences. It is the suspicion that we are "retained attorneys" that I would fain dispel. Can there be any doubt that a great obstacle to the reception of the minister's message is that many now alienated from the Church cannot get rid of the notion that the parson is paid for saying what he does, and that his utterances must therefore be discounted? The added force and prestige which would be given to a message delivered by one with a minister's sense of vocation, but without pecuniary complications, would be incalculable.

There is the further point that when the ministry becomes a man's sole means of livelihood, it is very difficult for him to withdraw should subsequent events make him feel that it is right for him to do so. Woe to the man who finds that he has made a mistake in entering the ministry! A talk with any moderator will soon convince anyone that there are scores of men in the ministry who are eating their hearts out because having discovered their inaptitude for their work they are obliged to keep in it as they cannot see any alternative. I suggest that it is not right for a man to have to remain in the ministry against his own judgment and desire, because the alternative would be destitution.

If the work of the ministry was done by men who had another trade or profession to provide for their material needs this deplorable

state of things would not arise. No man would be obliged to stay in the ministry who did not feel called to do so. There would be no heart-breaking endeavours to carry on a work for which he had found himself totally unfitted.

V. The Financial Incubus.

"We have created in the minds of many a totally false conception of the nature and the function of the Christian Church. We have laid financial and property burdens on the backs of our people that either altogether discourage them or demand so much of their time and energy that little is left for active and aggressive and constructive Christian work. We have built churches that we can neither pay for nor adequately man". (Edwin Lewis, *A Christian Manifesto*.)

An honest survey of the condition of our churches compels one to recognize that the existence of a paid ministry does impose a financial burden upon the Christian community which cannot be in the best interests of the Kingdom of God. Can anyone feel happy about the disproportionate amount of time spent on finance in deacons' and County Union meetings, due nearly always, directly or indirectly, to the necessity for raising ministers' stipends?

Those of us who sat through the long and weary sessions on the Report of the Commission of Enquiry at the Assembly Meetings heard enough disquieting things said to convince us that the burden of finance is having a crippling effect upon our denomination. We have been made to realize that we as a denomination cannot place our ministry on a sound and equitable financial basis because our churches are already too harassed by monetary obligations to make any scheme with that end in view workable. The task of providing a minister with an adequate stipend is very difficult for all our churches and almost impossible for some. And it is not comfortable to have to acknowledge that there are churches, discouraged and leaderless, and with apparently no future, because they are not in a position to maintain a minister.

Has not the time come when our churches should be relieved of this incubus of finance and left free to concentrate on their real work? It is true that there are many in our churches who are more at home in dealing with finance than in helping to make the church spiritually vital. And there are even some who argue that it is good for the church to have money to raise and debts to pay off because it helps to "keep the people together" and to "give them something to do".

Such arguments only reveal how far we have departed from the original conception of what the Church should be and what it exists for. That many can regard absorption in money-raising schemes as the normal kind of activity for church members is a reflection on our Christian fellowship. Why should it need bazaars and sales of work to keep people together? Why should it be assumed that people will

not work unless there is money to be raised? Is there nothing else to work for? Why should there be no interest in the church unless socials and whist-drives are being organized throughout the year to wipe off that fearsome deficit? Without entering into the merits or demerits of these various activities, one may question whether an interest which depends entirely on such things is an interest in the Kingdom of God.

It is possible that if the church were relieved of the necessity for raising ministers' stipends there might be a waning of interest on the part of some who glory in financial contrivings, and on the part of some who would sadly miss various activities designed to make ends meet. (That the Church as at present constituted could not exist very long without the arduous labours of these friends must be gratefully acknowledged.) But it is suggested here that in the long run the result would be gain and not loss, since the Church, delivered from its obsession with finance, would either have to apply itself more whole-heartedly to its own specific task of spreading the Gospel, or else die of inanity. If the outcome is a smaller but a quickened and more vital fellowship, who shall say that it is not for good?

VI. Barriers.

"I have to persuade people that there is a God at all, and to make them believe that evil is a more awful thing than pain and that a starved soul is worse than a starved body . . . . I can't make my life like theirs. If I tried, it would only be a pose and they would see through it. People like me never need fear an empty belly or the loss of a roof over our heads . . . . I ought to be doing a day's work beside them in the shops and preaching to them as a brother in misfortune. They would respect me then and I should respect myself". (John Buchan, *The Prince of the Captivity*.)

Another aspect of the question is the personal relation of the minister to his people. Generally speaking, I think it true to say that relations between ministers and their people are more human and intimate than ever before. Gone are the days when the parson was put on a pedestal, to be spoken of only with bated breath, and regarded as a being of a different order. Nowadays, the minister mixes with his people, has identical interests with them, and talks their language. Some, of course, are more successful in that than others.

Nevertheless, I think there are few ministers who will not agree that in their intercourse with men and women there is a sense of difference which makes it difficult to talk to people on their own ground. Let the minister be never so anxious to break down any barrier which may be caused by his calling, people find it hard to forget that, after all, he is the minister, and a certain restraint will tend to creep in. It needs a very special kind of personality to be

able to deal with people in a simple, natural, human way, as man to man, rather than as minister to a member of his congregation. It is not that I want the objectionable, hearty, back-slapping conception of the minister to gain ground, but only that in dealing with the spiritual needs of others, we should not first have to overcome this sense of difference which makes so many guarded and restrained in the presence of a minister. A non-professional ministry would have the advantage of allowing a closer identification with the people while at the same time providing the leaders to whom they would naturally turn for help on personal and religious matters.

A more serious aspect of the same difficulty is the feeling which so many have that the minister lives in an unreal world and cannot know the conditions under which they live and work, and that therefore his counsels and exhortations are to be discounted.

How many ministers, when trying to bring home the implications of the Gospel to their congregation, have had the frequent humiliating experience of being told: "O, yes, Mr. ——, but you know your life is very different from ours. If you had to work in the business world you would see things differently". The inference implied, though, in kindness, not often drawn, is that we live in a world of sentimental idealism, quite innocent of the real facts of experience, and that therefore the protests and pleas we make in applying the teaching of Jesus to everyday life are to be listened to with indulgence, but not taken too seriously, unless what we say is a bit too pointed.

There can be no doubt that the same presentation of the Gospel, coming from men working under the same conditions as those whom they were addressing, would have an incalculably greater force, and would give the objector no ground for evading the challenge on the ground that the speaker did not know what he was talking about. The man in the pew knows that it is one thing to talk about what being a Christian means, from the pulpit, and another thing to have to live it out in a hostile environment.

The same applies to the economic advantages we enjoy. When everything has been said about the hardships of men in the ministry, and the meagre incomes which many receive, it still remains true that most of us are in a privileged and sheltered position compared with many in our congregations. The fact that we find our income inadequate is more often due to the necessity for living up to a certain standard of life than to real deprivation. Can it be wondered at therefore that much that we say about the sin of worry, and the need for trust in the face of adversity, *etc.*, fails to carry much conviction to our hearers? Whatever may be the financial embarrassments of individuals, there can be no doubt that we do convey to a great many the impression of being economically secure, and immune from

the problems of those who have to live in a competitive system and have very little security.

To speak as those who have to depend for our income on the same kind of sources as the members of our congregation would at any rate give us a chance to demonstrate what living in faith and trust and freedom from worry concerning our material wants, means. It would also enable us to do something more than talk when trying to show what it means to be an uncompromising Christian in business and industry. It would give new point to the text, "I sat where they sat".

VII. Questions and Difficulties.

"The amazing multitude of Protestant sects is due in a great degree to the superiority of lay preaching over clerical. The most brilliant orators of the Christian pulpit are bad converters; their eloquent appeals may captivate the imagination and lead a few men of the world to the foot of the altar, but these results are not more brilliant than ephemeral. But let a peasant or a working man speak to those whom he meets a few simple words going directly to the conscience, and man is always impressed, often won". (Paul Sabatier, *The Life of St. Francis of Assisi.*)

There are certain obvious difficulties and objections which come to mind when we consider the abolition of the professional ministry, and I will endeavour to anticipate some of them here.

1. It will doubtless be pointed out that, notwithstanding Paul Sabatier's words, there are already lay preachers and lay pastors, and that there is no evidence that their preaching and witness is any more effective than that of those of professional status. In fact, most congregations would seem to prefer the latter. Moreover, when a church is without a minister, it does not appear that the church flourishes any more during the interim under lay leadership, and more often than not a prolonged period without a minister is the beginning of a decline.

Against this, we must bear in mind that churches at present are organized on the basis of a professional ministry, and have come to depend on it to such an extent that they do not readily adapt themselves to lay ministrations. It is possible that if the professional ministry ceased to exist, the laymen would get a new sense of responsibility for the spiritual needs of the fellowship, and be driven to equip themselves more, spiritually and mentally, for leadership. When churches are without a minister, deacons who have never done so before will often lead the worship and devotions of the members very acceptably, and take a measure of responsibility for the spiritual welfare of the church which they unfortunately too often relinquish as soon as a new minister is called. I believe that we have never yet got the best out of our laymen in the way of spiritual leader-

ship, and it may be that while there is a professional ministry to fall back on, we never shall.

2. It may be objected that the work of the ministry makes intellectual demands which only a fully trained minister could adequately meet. But it does not necessarily follow that an *unpaid* ministry should be an *untrained* ministry. It is surely not impracticable that men who have an aptitude for spiritual leadership should have a period of training and teaching which will equip them for some kind of ministry, without relinquishing the trade or profession which they have hitherto followed. Just as many left their jobs to join the army and received a military training, and then after the war, resumed their normal occupation, so it should be possible for some to interrupt their career for a time to take a course designed to equip them for leadership in the Christian fellowship, and for dealing with the moral and spiritual problems of their fellow men. In any case, a lot can be done in holidays and spare time, when a man is keen. It may be that certain academic qualifications will have to be sacrificed, and our ideas revised concerning the best kind of training for the practical work of the ministry. It may be that some will have to suffer the handicap of not knowing Hebrew. It may be that some will be in the unfortunate position of William Booth, of whom St. John Ervine says,

> It is improbable that he knew of the problem whether, as Bossuet asserted, St. Paul derived his mysticism and sacramental views of Baptism and the Lord's Supper from Hellenism, or as Schweitzer maintains, from eschatology.

But even with these limitations, they may learn to minister to the souls of men and to preach Christ crucified in a way that satisfies the mind as well as captures the soul. Men adequate, mentally and spiritually, to minister to people, but at the same time living the same kind of life as those to whom they minister—that, I suggest, is the goal we should aim at.

3. Another objection which may be raised is that the work of the ministry is a full time job, and no minister can hope to fulfil its demands if he has another job to attend to as well.

Since there is no question but that most ministers work very hard and find their time very fully occupied, this objection carries great weight. But I do not think it insuperable. Somehow, the Society of Friends seems to get on very well without having full time men, and I have never heard it suggested that their spiritual welfare is in any way neglected. I think that if an unpaid ministry were established, there would have to be a drastic revision of our conception of a minister's duties. He would not be able to serve on a good many of the committees which now take up so much of his time, nor be expected to preside over every meeting held on church premises.

It is an open question whether the work of the Kingdom would suffer from his absence from these meetings. Possibly it would lead to a simplification of organization, which is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Again, visiting is something which could be shared by all the members of the church and made one of the ways by which a more intimate fellowship is created among them. After all, if visiting helps a minister to get to know his people, it should surely help *them* to get to know one another. The minister would of course still visit as he is able, but he would be relieved of the incessant demands of visitation, and be able to concentrate more on those who through sickness or some spiritual problem more particularly needed him.

Then, also, the tradition of two sermons regularly every Sunday, with, maybe, an address in the week, would have to go. There would either have to be a system of exchanges, or the abandonment of the convention of two identical services each Sunday. I think the latter alternative is the better one, though it is more difficult, and needs more courage to initiate. But I am convinced that we have a surfeit of sermons. They not only tend to create that pathetic phenomenon, "the ministerial mind", obsessed with sermon preparation, but, however excellent, may become something akin to a drug to congregations accustomed to be mainly passive and absorbent in the worship and witness of the Church. An unpaid ministry may do something to deliver us from the obsession with sermons from which we are suffering and help to create a different type of service which is badly needed.

Some things, then, that at present take up a great deal of a minister's time, may have to go, but I am by no means convinced that the necessary, vital work of the Church would suffer, but only that we should have no time for anything but essentials. And from that, nothing but good can follow.

4. Another development which an unpaid ministry might make possible is a more effective use of the diversity of gifts which exists among those who possess qualities of leadership.

At present, the "one man" ministry makes impossible demands upon a minister. As someone has said, he is expected to preach like an apostle and visit like a postman. He must be good with children, and a young people's man, and at the same time *persona grata* at mothers' meetings. It is imperative that he should be able to entertain and be one who possesses plenty of social assets. He must needs be a good organizer and take an active interest in all that is going on, and yet never cease to be a student and keep up his reading. These are a few of the qualifications expected of the present day minister. The amazing thing is that such a large number of

men acquit themselves so creditably in these various *rôles*. But few are so versatile as to be able to meet adequately all these different demands, and often the absence of one or other of the needful gifts leads to difficulties and unhappiness. Also, the minister has a particular kind of responsibility which he must bear alone. And it is very questionable whether such a multiplicity of functions in one man makes for the most effective kind of ministry. And yet very few churches are in a position to maintain more than one minister.

Is it inconceivable that a time will come when finance will cease to be such a big factor in the maintenance of ministers, so that it will be possible for each church to have a number of unpaid ministers, each called to specific aspects of the ministry? What was possible in the early church (*Rom.* 12 and *I Cor.* 12) ought not to be impossible now. I look for a time when there will be something equivalent to the presbyters of the primitive church, all equally concerned with, and responsible for, the evangelistic and missionary and personal work of the church, but each concentrating on the particular form of ministry for which his gifts and training best suit him. Such a body would meet constantly for prayer; to discuss the most effective way of carrying on the work of the church; to consider how to meet the needs and problems of particular individuals, and how to bring waverers to a decision for Christ. This does not seem to me to be a fantastic ideal, but an indispensable condition for the effective functioning of the Church.

As I have ventured to call into question the necessity and desirability of a paid ministry, I have felt it incumbent on me also to endeavour to show that there is an alternative. I know that these constructive suggestions are open to criticism, but I am not concerned to defend them, as my object is to demonstrate that the paid ministry is not a *sine qua non,* and to leave in more competent hands the task of constructing an alternative.

MODERN CRITICISM AND THE HISTORICAL JESUS.

By the Rev. Bertram Lee Woolf, Ph.D., M.A., B.Sc., B.D.

The trend of scholarship for many years has been in a definite direction. It tends to link the New Testament and all it contains more closely with its historical background. Whatever else the New Testament may be in our religious life, it is a book written in ancient times among an ancient people, and both were widely different from our day. The more fully we can place it in its original setting, the more clearly we can see it emerging from its surroundings, the more firmly we shall be able to understand its unique features.

If we take up this attitude what might we expect to notice in regard to the handing down of the tradition about Jesus? It would seem probable that the tradition was carried on, spontaneously as it were, by a large number of people. Anyone who had ever seen or heard Him would have something to say of greater or lesser importance. Some of these people would be found among the groups of believers, but probably more would be outside these groups, among those who had had relatively casual and incidental contact with Jesus. Thus scraps of information and memories of events or sayings would be preserved in quite unexpected places. Who can say what recollection was or was not to be found in Caesarea Philippi, Bethsaida, and Jericho, which Jesus actually visited, or Joppa, where Peter dreamed, or Azotus, where Philip taught? Nor were the groups of believers confined to the important centres like Jerusalem, Caesarea, Antioch and Damascus; and all would be likely to know something for themselves. In any case it was essentially a proletarian tradition like that of Gladstone and John Bright which lingers in countless cottage homes, particularly in the north of England. The tradition of Jesus was remote from the schools, untouched by the discerning hand of the historian or the biographer as we understand it.

The contents of the tradition of Jesus would tend to consist mainly of striking epigrams, unusual events, and unexpected contrasts. As is the manner of proletarian tradition, each report or description would tend to assume a stereotyped form, for uneducated people always tell the same story in the same way and in almost identical words. This would be the case both inside and outside the groups of believers, although with a certain difference. Inside the groups, the tradition recounted by any one person would naturally be cross-checked with that of the others who were well-recognized "eye witnesses and servants of the word", as Luke calls them. Outside

the groups, such cross-checking might not operate at all, and here the tradition would tend to take the form of a highly individual recollection. It might easily coalesce with something of another origin or become confused with some memory of another person. We are familiar with parallel instances in the case of stories about Parker and Spurgeon.

In the process of time there would be two types of tradition, the "inside" and the "outside", the official and the unofficial. Nevertheless both the "inside" and the "outside" tradition would only be special parts of the general tradition and would not be distinguished from each other in their historical core, but only in the embellishments with which each was or was not burdened, and in the purpose for which each was recounted.

The "inside" tradition, especially of the greater centres, would tend, more than any other recollections, to be taken up into the written records. But the "outside" tradition, or at any rate elements of a tradition which were not preserved by the more important centres, actually lived on, and for a considerable time was valued as highly as any other. Some elements of it were occasionally used according to *Acts* (20^{35}) by Paul, and by Peter (*Acts* $10^{37\text{-}43}$, $2^{23\text{ff}}$), and others. Some elements were set down in sayings such as occasionally come to light in the papyri, or in records other than the canonical gospels.

Such observations open up the way to a fresh study of the Gospels and the whole of the early Christian literature. First attempts have been made to separate out the different fragments of tradition now enshrined in the Gospels, and to discover their original wording. The efforts are of course provisional and the methods highly technical. But already one can see the possibility of distinguishing different levels of primitive character, and of recognizing the unconscious influence of popular ways of handing down tradition. Various names have been given to these strata of tradition: Paradigms; Tales; Legends; Mythologies. These levels or types of tradition, as we are able to distinguish them in some measure to-day, are not to be understood simply as following one another in a time scale, as if the least embellished records were all older than any others. Rather they overlap each other in time and differ on account of the circumstances, culture, religious quality, and interests of the people by whom they were first recounted. Thus the paradigms were the incidents and teachings which were used mainly in the course of preaching. At the same period the tales or anecdotes were being employed in other connexions to satisfy the curiosity, extend the interest, or answer the natural questions of hearers and inquirers. The paradigms retain more of the primitive form and are least embellished in response to popular interests, because they became stereotyped by their use in the course of missionary addresses which were delivered repeatedly in much the same form. The anecdotes

or tales and other strands of tradition would tend to remain plastic for a longer period, and indeed until they were incorporated in the written sources. If therefore we can classify the material preserved in the Gospels, and deal with the separate types independently of each other, we may be able to obtain a view of Jesus from a new angle. Let us therefore approach our material with these ideas in mind, and choose first those passages which seem to be most closely connected with the earliest preaching of the apostles, and which contain biographical notices. These passages are not entirely confined to the Gospels, but are also to be found in *Acts* and the Epistles. By bringing them together, and apart from their present literary setting, we discover that they lend a new emphasis to what has really been long familiar.

Mark as it stands is our earliest extended historical document and we naturally search it for most of our data. But it is not a mere transcription of an inherited biographical tradition; it is also the presentation of a case. Thus the figure of Jesus is introduced in a setting itself full of the divine urgency and evangelical fervour. The first verse has no verb, but really says, "The way the message of salvation through Jesus Christ begins is in the following manner". Then it sets forth the Baptist as fulfilling God's word in *Isaiah*, and Jesus as taking up the work when John was imprisoned. Thus Jesus is immediately portrayed as fulfilling the divine purpose which was presented by Holy Writ, and which was introduced into history by John (*Mk.* $1^{1-4, 7f, 14f}$).

Mark's opening record is a piece of the earliest tradition. This view is confirmed by that report set down in *Acts* 10^{37-43} where, after declaring that God anointed Jesus with the Holy Spirit after John had preached, Peter passes over the whole life and work of Jesus in a single sentence. He is content to sum it up by saying that He went about doing good. Peter then comes immediately to the tragedy of the Cross, the triumph of the resurrection, and the glory of the apostolic commission. In *Phil.* 2^{6-11} Paul follows the same course, but sets the beginning more definitely in the heavens. He omits the reference to the Baptist, and concludes with the final glory of Jesus. This presentation of the case soon became dominant, for John's Gospel follows it without deviation in the prologue (*cf. Jn.* $1^{1-3, 14, 16-18}$).

It will be noticed that the additions made by Paul and John are not in the nature of historical details but of theological speculations designed to account for the unique quality of Jesus and His mighty significance for the next generations. Other developments were taking place about the same time, less theological in character and more closely in accordance with the normal growth of popular tradition. The unconscious aim is the same, but the method is graphic; and analogous traditions from Gentile and Jewish sources are followed, though it is quite probable that this was done unwittingly.

Here we think of the records in the first two chapters of *Luke*, and, with still further development of characteristics, in the first two chapters of *Matthew*. Whatever judgment may ultimately be reached in regard to the historical data behind these chapters, there can be little doubt that they present in a graphic way the same view as the more refined speculations of Paul and John.

Hence it would appear that our first historical acquaintance with Jesus is made when He is already in the fullness of His powers. He comes forward to seize the plough from which the Baptist's hands have fallen, and drives the furrows undeterred by the martyr's fate.

The atmosphere of the simple narrative would suggest that the religious sanctions and urgency which had given power to the forerunner passed over to, and were taken up by, Jesus, and here came to their full expression. The brief summary of the life's work of Jesus as given by Peter in *Acts* 10^{37-43} is made in five vastly significant words: *He went about doing good.* That sentence not only summarizes Christ's life but also sets Him in a certain contrast to the Baptist. John preached repentance and scarified the people. If he called them to repentance, he also stood over against them; his home was the wilderness, not the village; his mind was hostile and denunciatory almost as much as it was friendly and full of concern. But Jesus took up the work among the people and for the people. The story in the Gospels is the amplification of that record, and perhaps indeed was first set down for the very purpose.

The actual biographical data contained in the earliest surviving tradition are few in number but extremely significant and far-reaching. Apart from the Passion Story, to which I shall return later, these earliest references are found almost exclusively in *Mark* 1^{21-27}, 2^{1-12}, $^{13-17}$, $^{18-20}$, $^{23-28}$, 3^{1-5}, $^{31-35}$, 6^{1-4}, 8^{27-29}, 10^{35-37} & $^{41-45}$; $^{46-52}$ (*cf. Lk.* 9^{52-56}), 11^{15-17}, 12^{13-17}, 7^{24-30}, 11^{27-33}; *Lk.* 13^{1-5}. A few brief notes of a biographical kind are found in Q (*Mt.* 8^{5-10} & ^{13}, *Lk.* 7^{1-10}; Mt. 11^{2-6}, *Lk.* 7^{18-23}; *Mt.* 8^{19-22}, *Lk.* 9^{57-60}). Still fewer have been preserved by *Luke* alone (10^{38-43}). John never seems to have any strictly independent biographical data belonging to the earliest tradition, though it is sometimes impossible to determine whether he or Mark preserves the earlier form (*cf. Jn.* 6^{66-69} and *Mk.* 8^{27-29} *re* confession of Peter; *Jn.* 2^{13-17} and *Mk.* 11^{15-17} *re* cleansing the temple).

It is generally acknowledged to be difficult if not impossible to discover any assured chronological order in the subsequent events of the life of Jesus. Rather we have a number of independent glimpses which the evangelists have inserted into a general outline. If we follow Mark's scheme, we find that after the reference to the connexion with the Baptist he shows Jesus at work among the people, teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum, and in the course or at the conclusion of the meeting, he healed the sick (*Mk.* 1^{21-27}). His next appearance is again in Capernaum and similar events take place,

first teaching then healing (*Mk.* 2^{1-12}). The teaching was combined with the healing in such a way that it occasioned, and also silenced, protest from the scribes.

Up to this point of Mark's narrative Jesus has worked alone, but we now hear that He called Levi the son of Alphaeus; this again caused protest from the Pharisaic scribes (*Mk.* 2^{13-17}), since Levi was in the Roman service. Jesus apparently set the worth of the man over against, and higher than, that outer fact, and this throws a broad light upon Jesus Himself. He is one who acts without prejudice.

We now come to the notice in *Mk.* 2^{18-20} and this shows a certain opposition between Jesus and the Baptist movement. The question is that of religious fasting, and Jesus will recognize no compulsion, however desirable the rite may be in certain circumstances. The question of the Sabbath is the subject of the following paragraph and shows a similar attitude, which Jesus founds both on history and on common sense, *i.e.*, on what David did and on the fact, obvious when stated, that the Sabbath was made for man, and not *vice versa*. *Mk.* immediately gives another illustration of the same question, the case of the man with the withered hand (3^{1-5}), and shows that Jesus taught it was right to be as helpful as possible on the Sabbath no matter what the ceremonial laws or the possible disapproval. *Lk.* preserves the tradition of another incident with the same import, the case of the man with the dropsy (14^{1-6}), and we gain the impression that Jesus differentiated Himself from, and indeed broke with, current Judaism on this point. He goes His own way no matter what the orthodox think or threaten.

The next of these early notices (*Mk.* 3^{31-35}) carries the point further, and sets Jesus in a certain aloofness from His own family. His mother and brothers and sisters, *i.e.*, His nearest relatives, are those who do the will of God. And it is noteworthy that the succeeding notice (*Mk.* 6^{1-4}), although separated by two whole chapters of a different kind of narrative, shows the division between Him and the people of Nazareth. In this case, however, it is they who set themselves in a class apart, while He takes comfort in the epigram, born of common experience, that neither a prophet nor a doctor can do his best work in circumstances of undue familiarity.

The early biographical strand of tradition now brings us to the confession of Peter which Mark makes the centre and turning point of his whole Gospel (8^{27-29}), and of which John preserves an independent and apparently equally primitive account (*Jn.* 6^{66-69}). Both alike record that His disciples believed Him to be anointed of God, in each case Peter speaking on their behalf. (The record in *Jn.* is strangely at variance with the tone of his Gospel hitherto, where it has been evident all along, and to all men except the perverse, who and what Jesus really is.) The incident of Jesus blessing the children

is Mark's next bit of biographical record (10^{13-16}), followed immediately by that of the rich young man who came asking about eternal life. Both these incidents throw much light upon Jesus, and show Him tenderly human in His affections and understanding. He demands utter simplicity and yet the most strenuous endeavour for the sake of the Kingdom. This combination of gentleness, simplicity, and urgent demand receives illustration and extension in the stories of the disciples seeking the places of honour, *Mk.* $10^{35-37, 41-45}$; the unfriendly Samaritans, *Lk.* 9^{52-56}; the blind man of Jericho, *Mk.* 10^{46-52}; the anointing at Bethany, *Mk.* 14^{3-7}; the messengers from John the Baptist, *Mt.* 11^{2-6}, *Lk.* 7^{18-23}; the Syro-Phoenician woman, *Mk.* 7^{24-30}; the case of the eager followers, *Mt.* 8^{19-22}, *Lk.* 9^{57-60}; and the incident of Martha and Mary, *Lk.* 10^{38-43}. The cleansing of the Temple occurs among these early notices, in spite of Origen's scepticism as to its historicity. It shows, rather surprisingly in view of what has been said about Him hitherto, that Jesus had respect for the outer associations of religion, and also that He was capable of intense indignation. This last is a side of His character which is illustrated relatively often in the earliest narratives.

His commonsense directness, which we have already noticed, comes to expression again when He decides the question of giving tribute to Caesar (*Mk.* 12^{13-17}). This directness is more strongly combined with religious insight in His judgment of the Sadducean question about the Levirate marriage (*Mk.* 12^{18-25}) and about the problem of evil as illustrated in the example of the ruined tower of Siloam (*Lk.* 13^{1-5}). He responds at once to simplicity and openness in the case of both the Centurion at Capernaum (*Mt.* 8^{5-10}, *Lk.* 7^{1-10}) and in that of the Syro-Phoenician woman already mentioned.

Such are the purely biographical notices assembled from the body of the tradition which has been preserved with the least embellishment in the course of transmission. The lines sketched in are few, but they are sufficient to reveal the strength and swiftness of Jesus's mind, His tender and winsome character, and His forthright, untrammelled manner. Prime biographical value is not confined, however, to such records, but is to be found equally in the parables, which are unrivalled both for their objective teaching and also for the flood of light they shed upon the Master. A similar verdict must be passed in regard to His proverb-like sayings and epigrams. It is only when we use some such method as the newer criticism affords, and set out these incisive sentences apart from their context, that we recognize their extraordinary value. They come forward in great numbers, swift, keen, searching; page after page of them. They hammer at our preconceptions. They tear the veil of pretence aside, and plunge their sword-thrust into the heart; they comfort, strengthen, inspire; they surround us with God's love and care; they teach the need of prayer and how to pray; they set the new over

against the old, which nevertheless we must conserve and guard. They warn, command, exhort; they send us forth as messengers with an urgent message, and with our whole trust in God. And in so doing they reveal the very soul of Jesus. When we combine this rich material with the bare biographical notices, everything seems "to have hands and feet" (Luther). They show us a Jesus full of personal energy and independence, endowed with a power far beyond that of ordinary men. He is fearless in His attitude to Jewish tradition or traditionalist Jews. Yet He is tender and compassionate to all in need or neglect, and He is extraordinarily perspicacious (tribute money, rich young man, Sadducean question). Withal the urgency of God and His Kingdom is upon Him (cleansing the Temple). These are but cameos, or snapshots, but they are immensely revealing. Jesus is exhibited from many different sides and is seen to be equally many-sided, indubitably alive and real. If these notices were all we had as glimpses of the historic Jesus, it would be possible to give a character sketch of Him, or at least to say that His was the most significant personality noticed in ancient literature. In any case, the outline, the colour, and the force contained here must control our understanding of whatever else we find in the records. Here we are closest to the eye-witnesses and, in the words of the Master preserved in this way, we are listening in as it were to Jesus Himself.

This brief analysis must suffice for our present attempt to draw a picture of Jesus from these early and most authentic materials. The other classes of tradition enshrined in the Gospels emphasize further the miraculous element, or preserve certain typical legendary and even mythological traits rooting in popular modes of reproducing tradition. They add to the colour, but not to the essential force. They tell us more of the mind of succeeding generations than of that of Jesus. For our purpose we can pass them without further notice.

But there is one matter which we cannot pass by: I refer to the Passion. Here we tread on very holy ground; it behoves us to put forward any conclusions tentatively, and to re-examine them many times before we speak with confidence. Let it be said the new method of study seems definitely to assure us that the story of the Passion was the earliest of the long continuous narratives found in the tradition afterwards used by the evangelists, and hence comes closest to history. It was of the greatest value, of course, in missionary preaching, and yet contained material which gave profound offence to Jewish and Gentile hearers alike. Therefore the Passion had to be explained, indeed it had to be transformed from a stumbling block to the Jews and foolishness to the Gentiles into an event which showed the power of God unto salvation, *i.e.*, which showed that Jesus was after all, in spite of all, nay, just because of all, the divinely appointed Saviour of everyone that believed.

Insufficient attention has been paid to the "offence of the Cross" as felt by the audiences of the first missionaries. Those audiences must have instinctively asked how this man could have been the divinely appointed saviour, for had He not been rejected by His own countrymen, condemned by the religious leaders, experts, and officials of His own compatriots, and executed in the fashion of a slave by the Roman authorities? The very defeat of Jesus contradicted the contention of His divine saviourhood, for both Jews and Gentiles. Successful self-deliverance was the minimum requirement to support His claims, and a signal triumph over His enemies the natural expectation. Jesus failed in both. How was this difficulty met?

The answer is twofold: by the correct interpretation of the Passion itself and by the message about and personal communion with the Risen Lord. I shall deal only with the first: the Passion. All the evangelists keep to the same essential outline—Last Supper, Gethsemane, Trials before the High Priest and Pilate, Peter's Denial, the Cross, the Empty Grave. This agreement is more remarkable since the facts are presented with three interpretations by (1) *Mt.* and *Mk.*, (2) *Lk.*, (3) *Jn.* *Mk.-Mt.* presents the Passion in a way so closely connected with the Old Testament that the secret epiphany now becomes a manifest epiphany. *Mark's* own foci are Jesus's claim to be the Son of God before the High Priest (*Mk.* 14^{62}, *Mt.* 26^{64}) and the empty grave. *Luke's* Passion story presents Jesus predominantly as a martyr, the model of innocent suffering. He says not this is *my* hour (of triumph) but this is *your* hour and the power of darkness has its way. Jesus died professing tender but firm faith in God: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit". Hence *Lk.* gave a very different cast to the account, although it is essentially the same account. In *Jn.*, on the other hand, we have another transformation. For him the decisive moment was not the trial with its opportunity for self-witness as in *Mk.-Mt.*, for his whole Gospel is a record of Jesus's self-witness; nor was it the crucifixion or the empty grave, for the whole Gospel made it only natural that Jesus could not be harmed by His enemies; rather the decisive moment is His ascension to the Father, to His God and our God. This understanding could have led John to as far-reaching a transformation of the Passion as it did of the remainder of the Gospel tradition; but we find essentially the same story. Indeed, it is a common view that *Jn.'s* account is the most nearly historical of them all. This is probably not a defensible comparison; it is simply another presentation.

This is not the place to examine all the details of the various Passion narratives. Suffice to say that that of *Mk.* obviously contains or makes use of the earliest tradition, but that he and, to a greater extent, the other evangelists exercise a certain amount of freedom in presenting that tradition to their readers. It is, however,

important to see that in doing so *Mk.* was by no means merely arbitrary. He was guided, nay compelled, to do as he did by certain factors of the first importance. He transformed the Last Supper—and after all there was a supper which was the last—into a Passover meal because the churches by his time were using the rite as a continuation of and a replacement for the Passover. He gave the *details* of the Trial scenes to show that Jesus was, or claimed to be, the Son of God, and that Pilate found Him innocent.

Criticism of this character gives one at first the impression of being so radical that the historicity of the dreadful event itself is overshadowed by grave doubt. This would be much too hasty a conclusion and would go much too far. We have already referred to the stubborn character of the pre-Marcan tradition and shown that it pierces his record at several points. It was not a false tradition, but an ineradicable fact that was a stumbling block. *Mk.'s* task was not merely to make a dispassionate record of the events, but to put the right construction on the events.

Let us begin our constructive attempt by asking what was the meaning and the purpose of recounting the Passion story at all. Why not slur it over and concentrate on the teaching, the wonderful deeds, and the dynamic personality of the man of Nazareth? *There* were Gospel enough surely! and that is indeed the essence of the humanitarianism of much modern preaching. If, however, the Passion could be shown to be according to God's will, that would put an entirely different aspect upon the whole tragedy. One of the main points of the missionary preaching was, as we have seen, that Jesus came and fulfilled the scriptures, and another main point was that Jesus also died *according to the scriptures*. This latter statement can mean various things: (1) that it was prophesied that the Messiah would die, and die ignominiously. God willed it so, and so it took place. If this could be proved, then it followed Jesus was God's Messiah. There seems to be no doubt that this was the point for which many searched the scriptures, from the two men on the road to Emmaus to the Beroeans to whom Paul preached; and they found what they sought in *Pss.* 22, 31, 69, and *Is.* 53.

But (2) "according to the scriptures" can mean far more. It can mean that the very details of the final tragedy were prophesied in the scriptures. Closer examination of the Passion record in *Mk.* would suggest that certain details were only told, or at any rate gained vastly in importance, because they corresponded with what was in the scriptures: *e.g.*, the arrest and the mishandling, *Is.* 50^{6}; dividing the garments, *Ps.* 22^{18}; Vinegar, *Ps.* 69^{31}; wagging heads, *Ps.* 22^{7}; reckoned with evil doers, *Is.* 53^{12}; ? Scoffs of the robbers, *Ps.* 69^{9}; ? the Last cry, *Pss.* 22^{24}, 31^{22}, 69^{3}; ? eating with the traitor, *Ps.* 41^{10}. And the *O.T.* colouring increases in *Mt.* and *Lk.* Here then was prophecy and detail enough of the shameful treatment and death of

the servant of God. It has long been held that the early Church possessed a kind of book of proof-texts for purposes of debate with inquirers and instruction of initiates. Recent discoveries of papyri tend to confirm this view[1]. If we can accept this theory we can see how the chief point of the book would deal with the place of the tragedy of Jesus in the divine plan. There would be in fact a kind of Gospel according to the *O.T.*, and this Gospel would have a peculiar authority. Since it enshrined God's will *explicitly*, it would seem more assured both in general outline and in detail than the rather varied tradition of Jesus that came to believers otherwise. In any case, the tradition of the Passion would tend to be crystallized round and assimilated to the *O.T.* Thus the whole tragedy of the Passion would be presented as the detailed fulfilling of God's prophesied plan. The *O.T.* details would be put in narrative form into the Passion record. The proof was now complete, and the hearers could find in the story of the Passion and the Resurrection a message which was indeed a message of salvation.

This reading of the history of the Passion narratives seems to take away from their simple historicity, but it does so only in appearance. For without some such reading the difficulties are there, *e.g.*, *re* the story of Gethsemane, the denial of Peter, the charge on which Jesus Christ was condemned, the words from the Cross, the nature of the Resurrection. What are we to make of them, except as simple and humble believers who accept thankfully just that Jesus Christ died for us and rose again for us? But with the reading of history put forward by some members of the new school, we can do more. We can feel how the early believers were borne on by the strong current of the apostolic preaching. Here on the one hand was the evidence of an intimate acquaintance with the wonderful Jesus of Galilee, followed, after His ignominious death, by the dynamic and creative experience of the same Jesus as the Risen Lord. On the other hand were the blessed words of God in the *O.T.*, with its prophetic pages gleaming in a new light, and with glory breaking out ever anew as they searched the old but, now, reborn message. The two elements came together irresistibly, formed an indissoluble unity, and gave overwhelming conviction. The apostolic preachers were men with a message indeed. The tragedy was the final, ineluctable proof of the saviourhood of Jesus. He was the Messiah, He was the Lord, He was the manifestation of God. Through these convictions the whole events of recent memory were filled with a new meaning, and could be presented with irresistible power; and that is what the eye-witnesses and servants of the word, whether apostles, deacons, or teachers, proceeded to do.

A brief word must serve to indicate the position to-day. As yet we are not able to put forward a sufficient number of historical find-

1 *Two Biblical Papyri*, ed. C. H. Roberts, 1936.

ings for us to see Jesus clearly, but there are already several important gains: (1) we can understand better the many instances of non-correspondence both between various passages themselves and between them and the total impression of the person of Jesus. (2) The statuesque and remote character of the traditional conception of Jesus will not fit in with history at all. (3) The records, while seeming at first glance to have become atomized and to lack coherence, really present us with innumerable elements each full of life, and each borne by a tradition instinct with evangelic fervour; they are carried on the bosom of a larger but invisible current. (4) The Gospel was preached not merely officially by persons conscious of high prerogative and spiritual eminence, but by innumerable anonymous persons charged with the high spiritual potential of the message about Jesus, especially His death and triumph. (5) The person of Jesus behind them, and thus behind the records, must have been extremely intense, powerfully convincing, of unchallengeable insight and incomparable spiritual power. They called Him Messiah, or Lord, or Saviour, or Son of God, because no other ascription met the facts. He, whom many of them had known as a unique teacher and healer, or revered as a prophet unlike any other—He, though dead, was alive again. They could live in Him and for Him, and find perfect freedom in serving Him.

In other words, the Gospels offer us not only the historical data in regard to the origins of our faith in the Jesus of history, but also something that is in fact equally important for understanding that figure; they give us the historical data exhibiting, in their minutest structure, the reactions of the men who knew Him in the days of His flesh. Thus they show us Jesus alive between the lines. For we know a man not only by himself, his words, his deeds, his triumphs, or his tragedies, but by the response of his contemporaries and his intimates. It is in this field in particular that the new method has so far given most help. The new methods of approach seem to enable us to feel the heart-throbs of the people who were listening to Jesus. If we press in among the crowd we may catch a clearer sound of the Master's voice, and perhaps we shall one day all but see His face.

CHRISTIANITY AND SUPERNATIONALISM.

By the Rev. John T. McNeill, D.D.
(*Chicago.*)

I.

Viewed in the light of an abiding ethic, war is doubtless immoral; but it would be fanaticism to deny that good has been mingled with its evil. It has sometimes been more than half redeemed by the lofty ends for which high-souled men have participated in it. A Leonidas, a Maccabeus, an Alfred, a St. Joan, a Garibaldi, have actually enriched the human tradition by their conduct in war because, deeply convinced of the justice and importance of the cause they fought for, they were able amid deeds of bloodshed to infuse a transforming spirit into their fellows, by which each man's strength became the strength of ten. Nor should we deny the moral tonic of adventure, of the voluntary encountering of danger and hardship, which war has often afforded. The chivalrous adventurer in arms has often been a more praiseworthy character than the calculating trader or the ease-loving scholar; though here a large discount for romance has usually to be made by the historical student.

War, too, has sometimes been the means of the liberation of an oppressed people. In many instances it is not clear that war was the only possible means to this end; but in such cases as the Dutch and the Greek wars of independence it seems to have been the only means likely to succeed. And it is not unreasonable to hold that in these instances the resort to arms has been historically justified in terms of human good. In recent memory even some earnest pacifists were thrilled with admiration by the Chinese resistance to Japan at Shanghai. Opposition to war cannot safely rest on denial of the benefits that in certain historic settings have accrued from it. Advocates of peace must adopt a juster estimate of war's *rôle* in history. More pertinent to their cause, indeed, than the miseries of past wars, are the phenomena of historic militaristic nationalism in general, and its anachronistic revival at the present time.

Our peacemakers, whether they concern themselves with history or not, are probably at least soundly aware that in all probability any future European war will bear but slight resemblance to the last, much less to any previous conflict. They are reasonably convinced that if there were benefits from any war in the past there can be such no longer. Moral grandeur has deserted the modern battlefield, never to return. If there was something to admire in the Chinese attempt to repel an aggressor, the outcome, as was to be expected, only vindicated war equipment against unarmed patriotism. Except in provinces remote from the armament plants, war has become a

mere mechanized horror in which chivalry and personal heroism have less place than in the visitation of a pestilence or an earthquake. And even these backward regions are learning to recognize the cackle of machine guns.

The modern mutual acquaintance of the nations, too, destroys what moral sanction may have been claimed for war. A nation that simply and sincerely regards an enemy people as beyond the pale of civilization, and almost of humanity, can put opposing warriors, and even noncombatants under the hostile government, to the sword without suffering on its own part increased brutalization or moral loss. In time of war it becomes important for the propaganda department to cultivate such loathing for the enemy as will make the duty of shedding his blood a less distasteful one. When the enemy is comparatively unknown it is easy to create a belief that he is fiendishly savage or sub-human, and deserves the treatment that would be accorded to a man-eating tiger. Such was the view of the Turk industriously spread in the West at the outset of the Crusades; and such has often been the attitude of colonial adventurers toward primitive tribes. But as soon as the European has the experience which is expressed in Kipling's line, "You're a better man than I am, Gungha Din", the moral loss attending a war against those formerly alleged to be savages is such as to make civilized men recoil.

As between the Western peoples themselves, the notion of racial outlawry, and even of racial superiority, appears more and more artificial. Anthropology rejects the Nordic thesis. A parallel Italian or French or Celtic claim would be as plausible and as foolish in the light of facts. In the end such obsessions, or rationalizations of national emotion, will be abandoned, not without laughter.

The present day re-assertion of nationalism seeks to secure national self-sufficiency by policies of isolation. This involves resistance to foreign cultural forces and the censorship of foreign information and comment. But real isolation can hardly be maintained in the era of the radio, television, and stratosphere flight. The craving for an intelligent share in the thought and affairs of humanity will assert itself irresistibly. The degree of mutual ignorance necessary for the war spirit will be increasingly difficult for wrong-headed dictators to secure.

II.

The Christian Church, originally strongly pacifist, became militarized as it expanded and was associated with governments. In the times of Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian, Clovis, and Charlemagne, and by way of reaction from the militarism of Islam, Christian leaders found excuse and sanction for innumerable wars. Thomas Aquinas argued for the legitimacy of certain types of war—wars of defence against usurpers, and against heretics and heathen.

Yet even in the Middle Ages the Church did much to minimize local conflicts, either by benevolent arbitration or by sending the disturbers of Christendom on a bigger and better war against the Moslems. Even when the hierarchy took up warlike enterprises in Europe, it may be shown that in many cases the end sought, however mistakenly, was peace. But self-deception in the motives of war has always been common. Past generations had even less resistance to propaganda than the peoples have to-day. This ignorance, perhaps, God winked at: we to-day cannot plead ignorance of the psychology of unreason in which war enthusiasms are kindled.

In order to cast out from modern forms of Christianity the militarism which it has received from "the Western fighting male" in its attempts to christianize him, it seems necessary first to cast out the nationalistic spirit from which the war spirit is from time to time reborn. Modern wars have been waged not by feudal princes but by mighty nations: and Christianity has been too deferential to the nations. The Church, it is true, once attempted somewhat roughly to dominate them; but the fall of Boniface VIII marked the failure of that policy. Thereafter the Papacy negotiated concordats with them, and often took patiently their rebuffs and insults. The Protestant Churches have for the most part either felt so intense a national patriotism, or wished so to give the impression that their patriotism was faultless, that they have been in a poor position to criticize the national policy on questions of war and peace.

Early Christianity was not national, or even, in a conservative sense of the word, international. We may more truly call it supernational. This character it shared with Platonism, Stoicism, and the other idealisms which fed the Hellenistic mind. But the supernational, all-human aspect of Christianity was made a profound reality by the fellowship of the Eucharist in which His presence was realized who had said, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me". It anticipated some divine act or process by which the kingdoms of the world would become the Kingdom of God. Its picture of the destiny of the individual was marked by complete indifference to national or racial privilege. It conceived of its own group organizations as the manifestations of a universal holy fellowship derived from all the peoples of the world and literally abolishing the distinctions between them.

The concept of this supernational fellowship has been constantly violated but never extinguished. The wars of Christians against Christians have always been especially deplored by religious minds within the Church, and have been, significantly enough, the occasion of ridicule from without. In the spirit of supernational Christianity Erasmus wrote: "Does anyone presume to approach the feast of peace who at the same time . . . is preparing to shed the blood of those for whom Christ shed his blood?" Christian men were, he

Pacific School of Religion

found, "too zealous for the phantom of national glory". Valiantly he denounced the inconsiderate war-makers and clerical war-propagandists of his day. He is not the complete pacifist: he reserves the rare exception of a truly just war. But he is well aware of the ease with which nationalistic emotion can overthrow the judgment: *"Cui non videtur causa sua justa?"*

Except in the case of such radicals as Faustus Socinus, an absolute pacifist, the Reformers were cautious in their advocacy of peace. The Anabaptists inspired them with the fear of a general wreck of governments and consequent dissolution of society. Accordingly we find Calvin defending the right of governments to use gendarmes in order to maintain peace, and authorizing war against sedition and invasion. But he warns princes not to allow themselves "to sport with human blood" and soldiers not to regard slaughter as their chief business. Recourse to war may sometimes be necessary; but every other means must first be tried.

In cool blood, Protestants have doubtless generally held views similar to these; but few Protestants have been as free as Calvin from nationalistic emotion. It is in no small degree due to Calvin's supernational outlook that Geneva has become the present day centre of world politics and of world peace effort.

Christianity has mingled beneficently with the currents of political and social life in the eras of Roman imperialism, feudalism, and nationalism. It has survived the first two of these because it did not allow itself to be absorbed completely in them. Augustine could stigmatize a harsh, militaristic imperialism as *"grande latrocinium"*. Against feudal barbarism the Church set up the Truce of God and in the monasteries built her fortresses of the contemplative life. From both world-orders the Church escaped wounded and weakened. But she proved at least the possibility of realizing a true relation between the Christian fellowship and the secular society. To express this relation the terms employed for another purpose in the formula of Chalcedon may be of service: "*inconfuse, indivise*". Christianity should neither be identified with the State power nor quite detached from it. That a nation should be Christian is a goal to be approached if never quite attained; that Christianity should be merely intranational in organization, or nationalistic in spirit, would be disastrous; and modern Christianity has come close to this disaster. Christianity is denatured in proportion as it is nationally bounded and segmented.

III.

Pacifism, in numerous forms, has made marked advances in the Churches since 1918. In the event of a fresh outbreak of war between the science-armed nations it would probably play a notable part. Manifestly its success must depend in some degree upon its nearly

equal diffusion in the ranks of friend and foe. That pacifism in a humane nation should result in the speedy victory of a more brutal nation is not a pleasing prospect to contemplate. The majority of Christians are not likely to adopt that logical pacifism, or non-violence, which advocates the abolition of the use of force in government. If force is admitted in internal government it can hardly be completely abolished in international matters. Common sense will admit its utility in such cases as the Saar police force. Even Dr. Schweitzer's useful slogan "reverence for life" reasonably calls for the defence of life, and for the exercise of judgment in regard to the use of force in its defence.

The way to world pacification may be partly opened up by the negative pacifism which proceeds by personal and national pledges. But peace will be insecure so long as men are powerfully moved by "the phantom of national glory". Christianity, to serve the cause of world peace effectively, must endeavour to banish that phantom.

Medieval thinkers assigned to the secular power the sphere of the "temporalities". In an even narrower sense than theirs it is true that governments concern themselves of necessity with the temporal and transient affairs of humanity. Religion looks before and after, and upholds ideals that outlast the transient crises of politics and even the most enduring of political institutions. Men of religion, if they are also men of intelligence, live in the light of far-off probabilities and opportunities, and so prepare the way of the Lord. It does not require the imagination of an H. G. Wells to be aware that the future holds not merely internationalism but some kind of supernationalism. Five hundred years ago, as Caxton humorously tells, people from neighbouring areas of England could not understand each other's speech well enough to purchase eggs. Two hundred years ago some Scottish clans treated their neighbour clansmen as a hostile race. Two hundred years or five hundred years hence it is a virtual certainty that our dividing nationalisms will be as foreign to experience as the wars of Guelfs and Ghibellines are to-day. The nations may pass away by conquest, in a terrific devastation, leaving the race culturally and biologically impoverished. But their passing may be a euthanasia, through the timely advocacy of a better order that lies beyond nationalism, a humanism which is not the denial but the fulfilment of historic Christianity as a supernational religion.

In the light of the probable future, the chauvinistic voices of the nineteenth and early twentieth century are like the hoarse croaking of a teen age boy who is the despair of a singing teacher. But there comes a stage of maturity. Christianity has all the way been anticipating the maturity of the world society. Science may present the material, but not the ethical and spiritual, pre-requisites of Utopia. The Church must turn men's affections away from the transient

national edifice to the towers of the City of God, and create an emotional preparation for the commonwealth of humanity. The message will be unacceptable to conservatives and enraging to militarists; and some of its evangelists may become martyrs.

Platitudes about the brotherhood of man are not enough. It is necessary to arouse expectation, to impart a keen anticipation of a future era devoid of national cleavages. Woodrow Wilson once admonished an audience of ministers in these words:

> The business of the Christian Church, of the Christian minister, is to show the spiritual relation of man to the great world processes . . . Go about with the consciousness that you are setting afoot a process which will lift the whole level of the world.

Here, then, is a probable future phase of the world process which ministers should lead their people to face, and to consider in the light of spiritual values.

There are, no doubt, those who turn an incredulous ear to the forecast of the passing of the nations. But what is their own forecast of the coming centuries of Europe? History knows no stagnation, and in our time the *tempo* of social change has been accelerated. We hasten into an emerging phase of human evolution. About us many are asking: "What next?" "Whither mankind?" Under militaristic nationalism civilization is menaced, culture is impaired, and progress is hindered. In Fascist States nationalism takes desperate measures to rehabilitate itself. But is not its natural force so nearly spent that it will not much longer respond even to powerful resuscitants?

By medical science we keep alive the weak; by war we slay the strong. The strong, preferably among the enemy, be it admitted. But when once men weigh the fact that the blood of their foes will one day run in the veins of their descendants the business of "inflicting losses on the enemy" becomes less attractive even to the most calculating. Who that has a rational mind wants to damage the racial strain by the kakogenic selection imposed by war? But to him who, with heart and conscience sensitized by religion, perceives the ghastly alternative to peace, it may well become a passion to impart to his fellows a new and saving loyalty, and lead them to exchange their nationalistic patriotism for allegiance to the emergent commonwealth of man—in which may be realized all that is possible on earth of the Kingdom of God.

THE FAITH OF EDWARD WILSON.

By the Rev. H. I. Frith, M.A., B.D.

Twenty-five years have gone by since the day, at the end of March, 1912, on which Captain Scott and his two companions starved and froze to death in their tent in the Antarctic. When their bodies were discovered, Scott's "left hand was stretched over Wilson, his life-long friend". The editor of a New Zealand newspaper, on hearing of the tragedy, commented: "All were great, but I am sure that the greatest figure of all was my gentle friend, Wilson". In the now-famous biography[1], a worthy tribute, the full story of his many-sided life is related. Here an attempt will be made to describe the sacred centre of that life—his personal faith. As explorer, naturalist, doctor, and artist, Edward Wilson showed extraordinary gifts, but it was his personality which most deeply impressed those privileged to know him. Scott wrote home during his second expedition to say that Wilson "has by sheer force of character achieved a position of authority over others whilst retaining their warmest affection". A close companion of his in the South, Mr. Apsley Cherry-Garrard, has spoken of "the great faith which I now believe was at the foundation of his greatness"; whilst another fellow-worker paid him the highest tribute of all when he confessed to Mrs. Wilson: "I never thought the Christ-life possible till I saw it in your husband".

Human factors alone could never account for such a character, but certain dominant influences helped to give his faith its distinctive qualities. To his father's "broad view of things", and the "all-round education" he gave him, the son owed a debt which he afterwards acknowledged in a delightful letter beginning: "My goodness, Dad, I am proud of you as a father!" Through him Edward Wilson came of Quaker stock, and that inheritance was evident in his quiet individualism, at once modest and assured. He showed his ancestry also in his reluctance to limit communion with God to sacred buildings, as when he wrote to Miss Souper (who afterwards became his wife) describing a glorious sunset in Norway, and adding that she and his sister "could worship well under a sky like that, like true Quakers". It was perhaps this heritage which made St. Francis of Assisi so attractive to him. In a letter to Miss Souper he said:

> I don't know whether you have ever been bitten by that man's character as I have, and indeed I think it is the best after Christ's. I admire the man more than anyone else I ever heard of, and that's a thing no one can do without trying to follow him.

A drawing he made of the saint is evidently a labour of love, and expresses his own ideal of ascetic mysticism. He could write home a few years later: "I can kneel to a life such as St. Francis led—before

1 *Edward Wilson of the Antarctic*, by George Seaver.

his picture". As for modern teachers who influenced Wilson, "Ruskin (he said) I look upon almost as an apostle of Christ, but who else? very, very few. Perhaps Kingsley, perhaps Carlyle". He found in Tennyson's *Maud* food for his soul, and exclaimed of *In Memoriam*: "What a perfect piece of faith and hope!" A borrowed copy of it was the only book, apart from his Testament and Prayer Book, which he carried on the Polar Journey.

The Visionary.

Wilson's religious conviction owed its intensity to his personal vision. As Barrett Hamilton found, he was "a dreamer of great dreams", a man endowed with a mystical sense of God in and through His works. Delighting in beauty, he found Nature a means of grace. Thus he wrote from his beloved Cotswold country: "Upon my soul, the glory of God in Nature has never been so continuously with me as it is now". He could not understand why, on a fine Spring Sunday morning, people should want to worship God anywhere but in the open.

> Here, in the heart and love and life of Nature, and with Christ by my side, I cannot bring myself to go to Church.

The grandeur and vastness of the Polar regions so awed him that he found words from the Nature-psalms most adequately expressed his feelings. He exclaimed in a letter: "The works of the Lord *are* great and very worthy to be praised and had in honour". But he was equally sensitive to the loveliness of small things, and their spiritual significance:

> Once or twice I have seen heaven; I painted a primrose there . . .
>
> My little bird-pictures are just visible proofs of my love for them, and attempts to praise God and bring others to love Him through His works . . .
>
> Love everything into which God has put life: and God made nothing dead. There is only *less* life in a stone than in a bud.

And what loveliness of spirit is here disclosed:

> I feel inclined to kneel before anything that goes to my heart as being very beautiful . . . It is this feeling which has in the old days again and again led me to kneel and kiss a flower in the woods, or in a hedgerow.

His eyes were always open to the signs of the Creator. In the midst of a hurricane, when the *Terra Nova* seemed certain to be lost with all hands, it was Wilson who noticed that

> there came out a most perfect and brilliant rainbow for about half a minute or less, and then suddenly and completely went out. If ever there was a moment when such a message was a comfort it was just then.

With his own enjoyment of beauty went a longing to communicate

his rapture to others—especially to the one he loved best: "I would to God I could lay it all before you". To her he had once written:

> That's one thing I have always felt God wanted me for—to show His glorious Beauty to others who haven't had the opportunity of finding out the things that are so wonderfully beautiful in the most common country.

It was not only through Nature that Wilson caught a glimpse of the Unseen. The Christian picture of God as Father made an early appeal to him, as he showed in speaking about his confirmation in Gloucester Cathedral:

> I think I was always much more at home with God in country rambles than in Church matters, and I think I felt a confirmed *child* of God long before the good Bishop laid his hands on me. I like the expression "child of God" immensely, for it was just as a very child that I was always speaking and praying to Him.

What were evidently the two main influences on Wilson's personal religion are coupled together in his testimony:

> So long as I have stuck to Nature and the New Testament I have only got happier and happier every day.

Most characteristic is his description of himself, at a time when he was suffering from tuberculosis, as visiting a favourite haunt in the early morning, where he could

> watch the sunbeams gradually lighting up the different corners of the wood, and sitting like an old stump one was never noticed . . . with *Modern Painters* and the New Testament and a good deal of pain, but I was most intensely happy.

How much the New Testament meant to him is shown in what he did when he was a medical student in London:

> He paraphrased in his own language, and annotated without reference to any commentary, nearly the whole of the New Testament. He did this deliberately, as the prelude to each day's hard work, to set himself a standard to live by.

This work, Mr. Seaver tells us, is of great value because of its directness and simplicity and the author's intuitive sense of the meaning of even the most difficult Pauline passages. His attitude to the central figure of the New Testament was expressed in terms of his family motto: *Res non verba,* but he once confessed that he could kneel "before a Crucifix, and before any thought or memory of Christ and His life". For Wilson, prayer was a necessity and a privilege. He wrote from the *Discovery* to his wife:

> I get an hour to myself as a rule before breakfast when I am quite alone, and then I sometimes pray, sometimes read your letters, and sometimes write to you, often a little bit of each, and I feel it is all communion with God.

Nine years afterwards, writing from the *Terra Nova,* he told his wife:

> I simply love the Crow's Nest—my private chapel. I have spent the happiest times you can possibly imagine there . . . alone with God and with you . . . I feel as much at home there as in a church . . . and I just love it for my prayers and daily reading with you.

The Seeker after Truth.

Being at once a Christian visionary and a scientist, Wilson regarded the search for truth as a sacred quest, and the recording of his knowledge without conscious error as a sacred obligation. Mr. Cherry-Garrard has written of his Antarctic sketches:

> An admirer of Ruskin, he wished to paint what he saw as truly as possible. If he failed to catch the effect he wished, he tore up the picture however beautiful the result he had obtained . . . It is accuracy such as this which gives an exceptional value to work viewed from a scientific standpoint.

It was the same with his pictures of birds. They are admitted to be wonderfully accurate, yet without being mere faithful copies, for they are full of life. That indeed was an essential part of the truth he wanted to show. It was his devotion to truth which kept him so constantly at work, in the home period between the two Antarctic expeditions, on an investigation into the cause of Grouse Disease. His passion for truth is, of course, most evident in the work he did as naturalist on the two expeditions. It is astonishing alike for quality and quantity. The highest expression of that passion was the Winter Journey with Bowers and Cherry-Garrard, who has related in his great book[2] how Wilson said to him fifteen months before that Journey was actually undertaken:

> I want you to come. I want to go to Cape Crozier in the winter and work out the embryology of the Emperor penguins, but I'm not saying much about it—it might never come off.

It came off—that "weirdest bird's-nesting expedition that has ever been or ever will be". Three fearless men risked, and very nearly lost, their lives in the cause of science. Wilson's letter to his wife before he set out on that Journey reveals how he faced it:

> Life is a gift we are to use in His service, doing what is expected of us at all cost and at all risks; and this we are doing, thank God . . . I don't think anyone has tried travelling in midwinter before, and yet as there is no other possible way in the world to do this particular piece of work, it is up to me to try it.

Truth, not fame, was Wilson's objective in the Antarctic. "We want the scientific work to make the bagging of the Pole merely an item in the results". And again, when they were about to start on that last journey, he wrote:

[2] *The Worst Journey in the World.*

> Whether we reach the Pole or not I really care very little so long as we feel we have done all we could. I feel I am here for a better purpose than to merely get to the Pole.

There is also this noble "apology" for the life he had chosen:

> I do honestly believe that God's will is being worked out for us in what we are doing, and though it may seem to some rather more "worldly" and "scientific" than "spiritual", yet there *is* a spiritual work to be done here . . . Surely God means us to find out all we can of His works . . . and if it is right to search out His works in one corner of His Creation, it is right for some of us to go to the ends of the earth to search out others.

In his introduction to the biography, Mr. Cherry-Garrard points out that the

> question of the search for knowledge and its relation to religion is the real psychological interest of this book . . . This want to find out will take men almost anywhere: it took us to Cape Crozier, and Wilson to the South Pole and to his death; men weave it into their religion.

This has brought us near to the heart of Wilson's principles of living. In early days he had written:

> It's only real carelessness about one's own will, and absolute hope and confidence in God's, that can teach one to believe that whatever is, is best.

That faith he held unshaken to the end. His last deeply moving letters to his wife contain the assurance: "We are playing a good part in a great scheme arranged by God Himself, and all is well". Such a conviction had been won by thought as well as prayer. When he was a young medical student,

> every doctrine which the Church presented had to be hammered out on the anvil of his own personal experience before he accepted its validity.

He was a true Quaker in finding the seat of authority within himself, and not in any external tradition.

> Every man's conscience is a law to himself, . . . and therefore a very rigorous and exacting law, . . . for my present teacher is God Himself who has put the law in my heart with perfect liberty.

He was prepared to trust that Teacher when experiences came that passed his understanding:

> A sentence that I harped on years ago, and one that used to comfort me—so well—was this, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter". That saying has always been a perfect treasure to me; I have never been able to get along without it.

Reflection on his own sufferings from tuberculosis provided this solution to the problem involved:

> This I know is God's own Truth, that pain and trouble and trials and sorrows and disappointments are either one thing or another. To all who love God they are love-tokens from Him. To all who do not love God and do not want to love Him they are merely a nuisance. Every single pain that we feel is known to God because it is the most loving and the most pathetic touch of His hand.

The "simple, childlike trust" which was the essence of his faith in God made him impatient with false ideas about his Father:

> Why in the name of all that is holy were we always taught to fear God? . . . Can one kneel to God from any sense that He will be pleased to hear us confess that we are worms, and how merciful He is to let us live?

In another mood he could confess: "I never feel that I have suffered for any of my sins half enough". While he enjoyed life to the full, he had to face the prospect of an early death from disease, and his faith was triumphant then, and ever afterwards, at the approach of the dark enemy. He could speak of Death as "the door to Love and Eternity", and near the end he could write to his wife: "We will all meet after death, and death has no terrors".

The Man of Action.

When Shackleton got to know Wilson during the first winter of the *Discovery* expedition, he went to him with his religious doubts,

> to be met with the reply that faith in Christ was not primarily a matter of doctrinal or intellectual belief, but a way of life, a following, an allegiance.

The truths of Christianity to him were no mere theories, but the shapers of his character. "For Wilson", wrote a friend, "religion was a divine life, not a divine science". He was indeed an outstanding proof of Dr. T. R. Glover's remark that "when God matters to a man, all life shows the result". Yet one who knew Wilson intimately said, "I cannot remember that he ever talked about religion"; and Mr. Cherry-Garrard has recorded that he

> never revealed to us the depth of religious feeling which is apparent in those letters and diaries of his which I have read . . . You must not think of Bill as a "religious" man.

He goes on to say that the knowledge that Wilson used the Crow's Nest as a place of prayer "came almost as a shock", but that after learning how much his religion meant to him,

> I begin to realize why Bill made no comment when, after years of preparation and months of racking toil, he reached the Pole—only to find that the Norskies had been there first.

It was that victorious power to meet adversity which made his companions wonder. They

> noted in him "some mysterious force that triumphed, some faith that upheld" at all times of stress and emergency.

On such occasions his cheeriness and hopefulness were an inspiration to others. When the position became serious on the return from the Pole, Bowers was glad that Captain Scott had Wilson in his tent: "there is always something so reassuring about Bill—he comes out best in adversity". The secret of this was his

> unalterable conviction that there is no situation in human life, however apparently uncongenial, that cannot be made, if God be in the heart, into a thing of perfect joy.

Two outstanding virtues he had were courage and serenity. "Both morally and physically he was fearless", wrote Sir Arthur Shipley. "Like his religion his high courage was part of himself, inherent in him". Even as a student, "he would condemn a man's action which was not pure and sound in the strongest possible way". Vulgarity withered before his look of disgust. It was only before audiences at home that his courage nearly failed him! His fortitude during the hard southern journeys proved an infectious example to his companions. "It was easy to be brave", writes Mr. Cherry-Garrard of the Winter Journey,

> when Bill and Birdie [Bowers] were near. . . . It is curious now to look back upon these letters and diaries and see how much depended on religion with the man as a go-between.

The same friend recalls Wilson as "calm, unchangeable, serene, plugging along with a certain neat smartness and with a ready smile". That mid-winter venture was the severest test of endurance in even Wilson's experience, and his companion on it says of him:

> Always patient, self-possessed, unruffled, he was the only man on earth, as I believe, who could have led that journey.

That calm, unfailing courage was the product of rigid self-control. This he had practised from boyhood in learning to check "violent outbursts of temper", and the deliberate discipline of his strong emotions became habitual. There is a hint of his method in words he wrote before he ever went South:

> Rise above your difficulties—be sorry for *them* through whom your difficulties come to you. In refusing to be put out or annoyed, you are taking God's hand in yours, and once you feel God's hand, or the hand of anyone who loves good, in yours—let pity take the place of irritation, let silence take the place of a hasty answer.

This power to overcome evil with good stood him in good stead in the wardroom during the first expedition:

> I have never had my temper so tried as it is every day now, but I don't intend to give way. . . . It's a hard school down here, but I wouldn't have missed it for worlds.

He set himself in those days to correct a fault which had sometimes made him difficult to live with. He had been critical and censorious, and his caustic tongue gave offence—though indeed he always

suffered when he was "out of love" with anybody for long, and hastened to gain forgiveness. His moral progress is shown by the fact that

> he was "Bill the Critic" and even "Bill the Cynic" to a few of his comrades of the *Discovery* days, but he was "Bill the Peacemaker" to all without exception on the *Terra Nova* and ever after.

Servant and Friend.

In his youth particularly, Wilson was not a sociable person. Social gatherings were pain and grief to him. He was reticent and aloof, self-sufficient, perhaps at one time a little "superior".

> For all his geniality there was about him, as all his contemporaries at College testify, a certain inaccessibility. He never sought friendship, either at that time or after; men sought his.

Yet he was "immensely popular", partly owing to his "vein of delightful humour". At times he was conscious of solitariness of spirit, and had a longing for sympathy and understanding which his wife was able to satisfy. During the expeditions, he felt the pain of being unable to share his deepest thoughts and emotions with his companions, greatly though he appreciated their worth and valued their friendship. Such was the penalty he paid for the rare and sensitive spirit he had. Yet none of his companions guessed this inward loneliness, for no cabin was "more resorted to by all and sundry" when he was on board the *Discovery,* and during the second expedition everyone was aware of his quiet and helpful influence. Mr. Jacob Cross has testified:

> He was always the same; and the same to everyone. Many and long were the talks I had with him in his cabin in the winters. One came to him instinctively. One could talk to him on any subject whatever, or about oneself—he understood.

He had an unusual gift of sympathy, so that men leant upon him in their difficulties, conscious of his strength. When he was seeking health at Davos, he wrote:

> Even here I have my duties. I would do them, but never overdo them, lest I bore the people who want help. . . . Thank God for the assurance that I am wanted.

Twelve years later, he was still giving himself in the same way:

> I have had ample proof that I had a work to do down here, for I have been having talks with several people, and hearing grievances and confidences. It is a great thing to know that one has had a job to do and that one has been doing it more or less unconsciously and that to some extent it has come off.

"Always ready to help", is Wright's tribute to Wilson. He was never too busy to lend a hand to others, and "The phrase 'Ask Uncle Bill' was like to become a wardroom byword". Yet his own work

was never neglected, and his diligence was amazing. Time was to him a sacred trust, and he was almost morbidly conscientious, at some periods in his life, in the use he made of it.

> I get such a feeling of the absolute necessity to be at something always, and at every hour, day and night, before the end may come or I have done a decent portion of what I was expected to do.

During his training years in a London hospital, he gave up much of his leisure to work in the slums of Battersea, exacting and tiring service, as his often humorous descriptions of it reveal, for the children he taught at Caius Mission were the reverse of angelic. At that period he had a long talk with the Bishop of Zanzibar, as he had serious thoughts of going to Africa as a Mission doctor, but, owing partly to parental objections, this project was abandoned—and the world lost a great medical missionary. But whatever form it might take, the same spirit of service found constant expression. During the first winter of the *Discovery* expedition, Scott wrote:

> It would be difficult to say who is the most diligent, but perhaps the palm would be given to Wilson, who is always at work.

His energy was almost tireless, and the more severe the conditions in which his work had to be done, the more plainly did his faithfulness stand out. He thought nothing of his own sufferings in the Antarctic, but as doctor, and often as nurse also, showed a tender consideration for his companions which they never forgot. Mr. Cherry-Garrard has written:

> That sympathy, which in a way is love, was at the bottom of the devotion he got from us all. Whatever was the matter you took your trouble to Bill, and, immediately, he dropped what he was doing, gave you his complete attention and all his help.

The same friend has reached the heart of the matter in this tribute:

> If I were asked what quality it was before others that made him so useful, and so lovable, I think I should answer that it was because he never for one moment thought of himself.

Scott saw that too: "Wilson, the best fellow that ever stepped, has sacrificed himself again and again to the sick men of the party". In those last days, the supreme testing-time of his life, this man attained a height which, in his youth, he had seen and greeted from afar:

> This is the most fascinating ideal I think I ever imagined, to become entirely careless of your own soul or body in looking after the welfare of others.

When it is realized how great and good he was, the words of Mr. Jacob Cross are echoed in the heart: "He was the sort of man one would give one's life for willingly".

LIVING IN TWO WORLDS.

By Prof. JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM.
(*Berkeley, Cal.*)

WHEN Thoreau was dying it is said that someone warned him to prepare for the next world, so near at hand. His reply was: "One world at a time, my friend, one world at a time!" Admirable sanity and self-possession! But as a matter of fact—as none should have known better than Thoreau—it is impossible to live in one world at a time, at least in this one. One of our leading American pulpit-thinkers—of whom there are too few—was much nearer reality when he said: "The problem of life is how to live in two worlds at once".

I.

These two worlds of ours—what are they? One is the world we see and hear and handle—with all those sensations, reactions, automatisms, and configurations, by which we adjust ourselves to it—the psycho-physical world. A very real world in its way, this: a world that gives us pleasure and pain, health and sickness, wealth and want, life and death; and that keeps us on the alert every moment to meet its incessant demands and emergencies.

The other world, in which we are all living more or less, is an unseen but a very real world, more real—may we not say?—than the physical world. It is the world of duty, of truth, of beauty, the world of value, the world of persons. It is this world to which we attach that sorely misunderstood but indispensable and meaningful word *eternal*.

The first of these worlds is the world of perpetual change, of ceaseless flux, of birth and decay, of come and go, of past and present, of happenings, accidents, events—the world of the newspaper, the screen, and the radio. It is an active, busy, exciting, demanding world, a world of prizes and publicity, of quick extremes, of success and failure, of good luck and bad luck, of the street, the market, the bank, the theatre, and the law courts.

The second world is that of the inner realities, of the good, the true, and the beautiful, of peace and purity, of silence and self-command, of love and loyalty, of morals and religion, of the dutiful and the sacred, of worship and prayer.

II.

Perhaps the most striking thing about these two worlds is that they are so different in nature and character and yet so intermingled. They cannot be detached. You cannot by any skill untwist them.

You cannot separate thought from brain activity, beauty from sensation, duty from conduct, religion from life, selves from bodies, values from facts.

Nevertheless, the major issue for humanity as a whole, and for every individual, is: which of these two worlds is the greater? which is the most real? which shall be put first and which second? That is a vital, a tremendous, issue. Upon it hangs the fate not only of individuals, but of nations, of civilizations, of humanity itself. And it is an issue that is constantly, daily, almost hourly, being thrust upon us all by the very nature and constitution of things, by the universe, by life itself.

It is, therefore, the very voice of the Eternal, and of one's own soul, which speaks through Jesus when he says: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness". These are not the words of a religious fanatic, or of a one-sided Puritan. Note the comprehensiveness, the balance, the full recognition of the two-foldness of reality, and of life with its values and demands. First the kingdom of duty, truth, love, righteousness, and second "the other things" that go to make up the physical life and should not be ignored.

What would have been the spiritual achievement of Christianity, what would be the state of the world to-day, if this principle had been followed! What would be the unity, the harmony, the beauty of life if we could only win the proportion, the poise, the strength, which this adjustment would produce!

III.

The history of humanity, in one aspect, is the story of the struggle to adjust these two worlds to one another.

Realizing more acutely, perhaps, than any other nation the profound reality of the world of spirit, India fashioned its ideal of the holy man as one who renounces the world of sense, withdraws from his fellows, strives to suppress his instincts, reduces his food to the minimum which will sustain life, cultivates meditation and so at length feels that he has become one with the Eternal. This is India's earnest attempt to put the spiritual first.

It is hard for the West to appreciate, even to understand, this ideal, except perhaps as something curious and, in its way, picturesque. Someone has described an American tourist coming upon a Brahmin sitting on the bank of a river, absorbed in contemplation. The occidental seeker of oddities quickly fixes this choice specimen in the finder of his camera, snaps, rushes up, and thrusts a coin into the hand of the astonished mystic and is off. When he is gone the Brahmin looks at the coin, gets up, and throws it into the river, and sits down to try to recover his composure. "East is East and West is West"—and is this the way to meet?

Greece, trying to solve the same problem of adjusting the two worlds, achieved one of the outstanding spiritual victories of the race. Catching the vision of pure and perfect beauty, the Greek embodied it in such chaste and noble symmetry as the Parthenon still preserves and in such union of dream and execution as the Hermes of Praxiteles and the Venus of Melos; gaining the vision of eternal Truth and Righteousness he wrought it into the precepts of Socrates and the dialogues of Plato; realizing something of the majesty of moral law he embodied it in the dramas of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. In such enduring works of art and literature the world still finds imperishable expressions of the eternal order.

China, patient mistress of the millenniums, meeting with undaunted equanimity the ever-pressing obligation of adapting the temporalities to the eternities, the demands of the flesh to the claims of justice and charity amid the adversities of drought and flood, toil and want, produced as her finest achievement the Wise Men, Confucius and Mencius, who sought to embody eternal justice and honour in morals and government. This was her conception of the incarnation of the spiritual in the temporal.

Israel, God's elect, strove to give herself up to the guidance of the Eternal, following her appointed leader through the wilderness toward the land of promise, and voiced her sense of the eternal Righteousness in the prophets and her consciousness of the eternal Love in the psalmists, whose noble spirit and burning words are still inspiring us to-day.

IV.

Yet none of these racial ideals fully succeeded in effecting the adjustment of the eternal world to the temporal. India's holy men failed in the practical task of translating truth into every-day life and its needs. Her *bhiku* was too far withdrawn from his fellows. The Greek put his creative sense of beauty into his temples, his statues, his mortuary *steles* and vases, his sacrificial processions and athletic contests, but did not succeed in hallowing his individual, home, and civic life. Devoted to his city-state, toward his fellow men in other city-states he was contemptuous and hostile.

The wise man of China tried earnestly and patiently to introduce the precepts of eternal right and justice into the government of the state, but failed. Confucius finally withdrew from public service and contented himself with gathering the wisdom of his predecessors into the sacred books, worthy service but not the greatest.

Isaiah and Jeremiah, Amos and Hosea, could hardly do more to arrest the indifference of their fellows to the higher life and to restrain their mad plunge into sensuous self-indulgence than to protest in the name of Jehovah against it. "Thus saith the Lord" was the word of warning which they brought from the Eternal, but how little was it heeded!

V.

Virtually alone and with unrivalled creativeness and poise, Jesus kept the perfect balance of the two worlds, lived in both with entire freedom and understanding, preserved His ideal unsullied, refused to listen to the temptations of lower motives, kept His vision clear and His heart pure, yet entered fully into the simpler and sweeter enjoyments of life; loved the fields and the lakeside and the garden; felt the charm of childhood; delighted in the companionship of others, sat down with pleasure at the table of His beloved friends and ate with publicans and sinners—responsive, sympathetic, affectionate—one who filled the daily task and the hourly contacts with the very spirit of the life eternal, yet could be stern as well as gentle, rebuked the sin and shame of His fellows, cast out the money-changers from the Temple, and as His supreme enterprise gave His life to reunite the two estranged and hostile worlds and to reconcile and empower men to the difficult but creative task of living in two worlds at once.

Nor was His own life and death His only answer to the question of how to live in two worlds. He saw very clearly that such a life requires a social order for its realization. Therefore He constantly held before His fellows a Kingdom of God, a corporate righteousness, a social order, in which the claims and opportunities of both the spiritual and the physical should be rightly met and the harmonious adjustment of the two secured.

VI.

The impact of Christ's personality and message produced an immediate and vitalizing effect. His disciples caught the vision and took up the task with devotion and determination. The divine fire spread. The pearl of great price was found. The mustard seed sprang up and grew. But the task proved too difficult. All too soon the balance was lost. The ascetic distorted and discredited the spiritual by neglecting the temporal, and the ecclesiastic the temporal by neglecting the spiritual. The anchorite withdrew from the world and the churchman succumbed to it. The Kingdom of the Spirit was rent. Discord invaded the divine harmony which had begun to reveal itself.

Yet the vision was not wholly lost. Effort after effort has been made to recover it. Individuals, groups, communities, churches, social sodalities, have arisen seeking to unite the two realms of nature and spirit and make human life righteous and concordant. Savonarola in Florence, Calvin in Geneva, Cromwell in England, the Puritans in New England, strove to subordinate all the domains of life to religion. Innumerable social and religious Utopias have been founded in hope and failed in execution. Democracy, Socialism, Communism—what are they but endeavours to correct the wrongs of the political, social, and industrial body and restore to man a life

in which material goods shall be justly divided so that men may cultivate more fully the enjoyments, if not the higher interests, of life?

But how elusive has been the dream, how difficult the task, both for the individual and for society! The holy city, New Jerusalem, is ever coming down out of heaven to haunt and allure. But how impossible to reproduce the purity of its streets, the harmony of its homes, the nobility of its pursuits! How hard to realize its co-operative enterprises, its high comradeships, its humane and happy life! The Kingdom of God? The City Beautiful? Christian Civilization? All seem to-day like a mocking mirage, an empty dream. Living harmoniously in two worlds so diverse, so often seemingly hostile, so easily sundered, so absurdly out of keeping with one another—is it not the extreme of folly to cherish such a notion? Why let the Christ disturb us longer with His vision? Why not abandon it and strike out for such actual spoils as can be had—leaving the Visionary, with his *naïve* ideas, to be forgotten?

VII.

And yet the Son of Man is with us still. He cannot be relegated to a remote past. He refuses to leave us to our lower aims and pursuits. The clear, sane, convincing, accent of His emphasis falls on our confused and disloyal minds with the calm confidence that that which is eternally right must be possible. The men and women who have trusted His vision and lived for it—have they wholly failed? Have they not lifted life to a nobler level? The occasional, all too fleeting, approaches to such an ideal, in the early churches, the great revivals of religion, art, culture—however isolated and soon exhausted—have they not been splendidly, reassuringly, revealing?

Have not we, even to-day, in the midst of the re-arming of the world, the resurgence of racial, national, class, and individual enmities, the renascence of hedonism and the decay of morals—have not we had a fresh vision of the possibilities of a world organized, humanized, unified, and of a life in which the spiritual controls and transfigures the material, such as men never have had before?

No shallow ideal this, no easy-going enterprise, to live in two worlds at once, so that the higher shall transfuse the lower! It requires a metaphysic as well as an ethic, logic as well as art, wisdom as well as faith. But it is our human task, individual and corporate, and our alluring and divinely guided enterprise.

THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING.

By the Rev. L. T. Towers, M.A.

"Why is there any misery at all in the world? Why did not God render the whole world happy?" In this form David Hume stated the classic question of the ages, the question which has occupied the minds not only of the world's great thinkers, but also of the multitude of ordinary men and women in face of personal experience. Pain and suffering are woven into the texture of human life, and the most simple and most unreflective person may be suddenly confronted with the insistent question—"Why?"

It is easy enough to say, as many philosophers have said, that pain and suffering are a *sine qua non* of the possibility of happiness, a kind of logical necessity of the Universe. The problem of pain is included in the whole problem of evil, and it is obvious that were there no possibility of evil, there could be no knowledge of good. There can be no morality without freedom, no freedom without risk, no risk without the pain of possible disaster. A universe in which suffering was non-existent would be one in which happiness was inconceivable.

This may be logical enough, but logic is only the grammar of our minds and is not the tool wherewith to penetrate the mysteries of the Universe. It is good, so far as it goes, but it does not go very far. It does but touch the fringe of the problem. It cannot answer the question why so much suffering is apparently undeserved, indiscriminate, and agonizing. It cannot tell us why Reality is so constituted that a world of untroubled happiness in which no suffering exists is inconceivable. It does not explain why, as a matter of fact, many people do look forward, with varying degrees of assurance, to such a world in some future state of bliss.

We must move forward from reason to faith. We have to decide for ourselves what is fundamentally the nature of the Universe—whether friendly or hostile, good or evil. After the evidence has been called and marshalled, we must make our choice as an act of faith. The very fact that we speak of a "problem of evil" rather than a "problem of good" shows where the general belief of mankind takes its stand. We believe (to adopt Canon Streeter's phrase[1]) that evil is parasitic, and good is fundamental.

What place, then, in a Universe ruled by a beneficent Creator, is to be ascribed to Suffering? Three ways of attempting to meet this agelong problem may be distinguished.

1 *Reality*, 222.

(1) *The view that Suffering is a Divine ordinance for the punishment of wrongdoing.*

This was the generally accepted view of the ancient world, against which two classical protests may be noted. Plato, in the *Republic*[2], contends that God, inasmuch as He is good, cannot be the cause of evil.

> If a poet writes about the sufferings of Niobe, as Aeschylus does, . . or the calamities of the house of Pelops, or the disasters at Troy, or any similar occurrences, either we must not allow him to call them the work of a god, or if they are to be so called, he must find out a theory to account for them, . . and must say that what the god did was righteous and good, and the sufferers were chastened for their profit; but we cannot allow the poet to say that a god was the author of a punishment which made the objects of it miserable.

Plato does not really offer any solution to the problem other than to suggest that suffering, if a divine origin is to be ascribed to it at all, must be conceived as operating ultimately for man's good.

The other classic example is, of course, to be found in the *Book of Job*, where for the first time the traditional Hebrew theory of suffering as punishment for wrongdoing was challenged. From the introduction of the problem as it affects the life of an individual, the great drama proceeds with majestic movement to develop its cosmic significance, rising to a climax in the voice of Jahveh from the whirlwind. The problem is there stated in its most vivid and dramatic form, but it is not answered. It was enough for the ancient writer that he should make his protest against a comfortless and self-satisfied orthodoxy, and leave it there.

> Shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty?
> He that argueth with God, let him answer it.

The mere mention of so long-discredited a theory might have been out of place in this discussion were it not that much of the popular thinking of the present day has advanced no further than the position of Job's comforters. "What have I done to deserve this?", is the cry of thousands when personally confronted with the grim fact of suffering. The implication is that in some way or other they suppose suffering to be a punishment of God upon their sin. That notion was exploded 400 years before Christ, yet its shattered remnants are still to be found in the minds of our fellow-men, despite the fact that it is true neither to the Christian revelation nor to the deepest human experience.

(2) *The view that Suffering is an Illusion based on the supposed unreality of the material Universe.*

Defeated in their attempts to find any satisfactory solution to this problem, many people to-day are turning for comfort to the doctrines

[2] 380[B].

of so-called "Christian Science". This teaching, though it has certain affinities with the old gnostic systems of the past, is commonly associated with the name of Mrs. Baker Eddy, and appears to-day as one of the peculiar features of the modern world.

The position of "Christian Science" is based on a denial of the reality of the material world, and consequently of all evil and suffering. What we call "pain" does not really exist at all, and is simply the result of "wrong thinking". This theory, if it can be dignified by such a term, is simply an ingenious device for solving the problem by denying reality to that which constitutes the problem. Unfortunately it will not stand the tests either of reason or of common sense. It is repugnant to common sense because it denies reality to that which our own experience teaches us to be only too real. It does not satisfy reason because it starts with a huge unproved assumption and ends with a *reductio ad absurdum*. Furthermore, it entirely ignores the fact that often the most intense suffering is not physical but mental in its origin. The way to Calvary lies through Gethsemane.

The popularity of Christian Science to-day is due to the simple fact that relief from suffering and even cure of disease has not infrequently resulted from it. That fact cannot be denied and should not be minimized. But the same may be said of psychotherapy, faith-healing missions, and even the general practitioner. Any responsible psychologist could give numberless instances of the extraordinary suggestional power of religious faith, or even of a faith that is without foundations. In any case, the success or failure of the methods of Christian Science in practice affords no proof of the truth of its teaching. Indeed, it would not be too much to say that the practical value of Christian Science lies in that which it shares in common with all forms of mental suggestion and not in the muddle-headed doctrines of Mrs. Eddy. Christian Science succeeds in spite of its founder rather than because of her.

(3) A third way of approaching the problem of Suffering is by means of that which is implicit in the Christian Revelation.

Suffering may be transformed into a Sacrament, a Vehicle of the Divine Purpose.

It has often been pointed out that the New Testament nowhere attempts to answer the question why either pain or moral evil is permitted to exist. It accepts it as part of man's environment, but accepts it as a reality to be faced and *used*, not to be evaded nor explained away. The Christian view of suffering is that though in itself it is not God's will that His children should suffer, yet according to the way in which it is faced or endured so it may produce some great and good thing. There is no birth without pang, no regeneration without agony.

In the Cross of Christ God Himself enters into the suffering of the world. The Cross sheds its strange light over the dark fields of human history as the unique symbol of conquest by suffering. Yet the Cross is no mere event in history. It is the invasion of the Eternal into Time, the unveiling of the heart of God, the forthtelling of the mystery of the Universe. At the centre of the cosmos is love, suffering that a world may be reborn. Paul catches a glimpse of the cosmic significance of suffering in the words[3] :—

> We know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, the redemption of the body.

Yet it is not true to say that suffering in itself possesses this recreative power. Canon Streeter has pointed out[4] that not all suffering has regenerative power, only that of which Christ's is the type. The *natural* result of suffering is degradation. But it is possible for the individual so to face suffering as to transmute it into a sacrament. The "natural" consequences are reversed in the case of suffering endured for the sake of an ideal. Paul has another strange saying (*Col.* 1^{24}) in which he speaks of our paying part of "the unpaid balance of the sufferings of Christ". There are some who have mediated God to their fellows by the *Via Crucis,* and have made the mystery of pain luminous. A dying man was once visited by a minister who said to him, "We are all praying that you may not suffer much". "Oh, suffering does not matter", was the reply, "I have passed through my Gethsemane. I am thinking of the glory that shall be revealed". These are they who share in the sufferings of Christ, reveal afresh the Love of God, and help to bring the Kingdom to the birth.

It is only when pain is conquered that it becomes power. All depends on how we face the problem as it presents itself to us in personal experience. There is an element of contingency which runs through human life, and it is just this element of contingency which confronts man with the necessity for self-sacrifice if the highest good for humanity is to be realized, and the sovereignty of God established in the hearts of men.

In the light of the Christian revelation Hume's question is really beside the point. We cannot even approach the problem by having resort to the pleasure-pain calculus of Hedonism. The whole issue must needs be raised to a higher level. In George Eliot's words:

> We can only have the highest happiness, such as goes along with being a great man, by having wide thoughts and much feeling for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves, and this sort of happiness often brings so much pain with it, that we

3 *Rom.* $8^{22f.}$ 4 *Cf. Reality,* 243 f.

can only tell it from pain by its being what we should choose before anything else, because our souls see it is good.

Two men were once visiting a little village in the Tyrol and went out together one evening in the moonlight. They paused for a few moments upon a bridge over the stream and gazed around at the snow-capped mountains. There was no sound; the village was asleep; silence reigned. Here, it seemed, was peace, far away from the strain and racket of the world. Then one of them, turning, caught sight of an iron crucifix wrought into the stonework of the bridge, and the sight sent a stab through his heart as though a voice had spoken: "O foolish men, to think that peace can be secured by mere seclusion!" Even here, in this quiet valley, the Cross was at the heart of things[5].

The Cross stands for the eternal principle that only from death comes life, only from suffering the new creation. It is wrought into the fabric of the universe. It reveals to us the very stuff of Reality.

[5] I am indebted to Dr. Wheeler Robinson for this illustration.

Dr. Katherine M. Wilson has gathered together some fifteen essays in her volume *Thought and Imagination in Art and Life* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), ten being on Art, and the other five on Life. The first group is taken up chiefly with literature, and the second group for the most part with ethics. The essays on literature are much the best; those on life are slighter, and raise questions—*e.g.*, the one on "The Moral Sense"—which need a much fuller treatment. The essay, "Imagination and the Poets", and that on Emerson, are studies in criticism, and would by themselves make the book worth while. The essay on "The Lasting Quality in Tennyson's Poetry" is all too short; it is interesting to find the author saying that Tennyson will yet come back into his own. Dr. Wilson is a psychologist; but when she forgets her psychology, and trusts her own literary instinct, her page lights up. This is a welcome book, with an underlying vein of healthy mysticism in it.

Dr. F. Townley Lord is widely known as a preacher with a quick understanding of the life of to-day, and all the addresses in *Christ in the Modern Scene* (Epworth, 2s. 6d.) are alive with interest. They are a good instance of "applied preaching". They are well illustrated from almost every point of the compass.

Mr. H. W. Shepheard-Walwyn's *Tongues in Trees* (Stockwell, 2s. 6d.) is as good a half-crown's worth of Nature illustrations as one could wish to come across. The author knows Nature, and knows how to tell a Nature story. I am glad he knocks on the head the stupid notion that it was the Arabs who fed Elijah; that particular invention of modern criticism has always seemed to me a gross example of wooden-headedness. There is any amount of good illustration in Mr. Shepheard-Walwyn's book; though some of its theology is not mine.

A. T. S. James.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

IN PRAISE OF LAY PREACHERS.

By the Rev. William Harrop.

The village churches of Nonconformity depend almost entirely upon the ministry of lay-preachers. Town churches are increasingly shy of them and, frankly, their chief work is done in the small churches of the countryside. One such church is now, in the quiet years after a life-time in the active ministry, "my church". It is in a village flanked on one side by wooded hills, and on the other side a long arm of the sea stretches far inland as if anxious to touch the fine mountains that stand there.

Many villages have a grassy centre—a green on which stands an ancient tree; at the centre of ours are houses with mullioned windows and doorways with lintels showing far-gone dates and the initials of the forgotten men who built them.

We have three churches—Roman, Anglican, and Free (Congregational), and in the make-up of its fellowship the Free Church is as genuinely catholic as any of them. Our minister is a venerable old man whose preaching days are ended. He founded the church and for five and twenty years has been its unpaid and yet devoted leader. He still leads but the preaching must be done by others. So it comes to pass we often have laymen, and let me say at once no one need waste any sympathy on us because of this.

Like those to whom they look up, lay-preachers vary tremendously. Ours do. One whom we all welcome is a grocer. His sermons are carefully prepared and well delivered; his prayers are prayers indeed. The other Sunday our preacher gave us a really helpful service—and he is a village blacksmith. The following Sunday a farmer preached on "Sincerity"; his definitions of the word and his illustrations of it would have done him credit in a church ten times the size of ours.

Of course we get our share of indifferent preaching—who doesn't? But even then, I for one find ways of profitable escape. Fortunately, we have no windows of stained glass. To me, it would be a distinct loss if the view straight before my eyes were shut off even by richly coloured glass. At times, the farm on my right provides too much escape. One Sunday morning a flock of young turkeys did a goose-step along the top of our boundary wall. It was an orderly procession, and silent too. Then—to make a further confession—another way of escape easily opens out: my thoughts go roaming among long-past years. I become young again and see my first pulpit and first church. It is a morning in June and through the open windows comes the twitter of busy birds. What congregations there were! I see family pews well filled. I see faces of children who now are parents, faces of parents now gathered to their fathers. Gladness and sadness get strangely mixed and . . . a voice calls me from my wanderings—"Let us sing our closing hymn". I go home thanking God for another helpful service.

Of some good things we can be always sure. Our laymen stick to central themes and give us great texts—and a good text goes a long way. They never air their doubts. If they wander far from their text, as they do at times, they never get far from their congregation. They are personal and practical every time. A sermon to them—even, perhaps, more than they realize—is a means and not an end. The other Sunday we had a sermon on the visit of Jesus to Jerusalem when He was twelve. "Why", asked the preacher, "why didn't the parents on their homeward way miss Jesus earlier?" His answer was: "Because their minds were so full of what they had seen and heard in the great city—He was overlooked, crowded out". Then came this application—"How often *we* come back from our conferences and union meetings just like that! We are full of excitement, full of talk of the great speakers we have heard, the many old friends we have met, and we do not realize we have lost and yet not missed—Him." No commentary supplied that, not even practical Matthew Henry.

Some of our preachers have little sense of time—and we have no clock. A while ago, one took out his watch, looked perplexed and said—"I'm very sorry there is no time for a sermon". We hearers knew that, and it was a real relief to us to hear that our preacher too had come to know it. The last hymn went well.

Comparatively few of our lay-preachers are young men, and this is a disquieting fact. It is so for two reasons: as the grouping of churches grows (as it must) we shall need an increasing number of laymen; then, too, we Free Churchmen must bear our witness that our devoted and gifted laymen have a sure place in the ministry of the Church. They too are heralds of the Good News; they too are called and sent by the Head of the Church. Because this is not

stressed as it might be numbers of our young men are lost to this sacred service and lost to the Church; their energy, idealism, and ability are carried elsewhere.

LITURGIES *versus* "FREE PRAYER".

By the Rev. A. Garfield Curnow.

Let me begin by a frank statement of the thesis of this brief article. It seems to me that "free prayer", *at its best,* is of a higher order than any liturgy; it is nearer the heart of man, truer to the root idea of prayer, and more akin to the essential genius of Christianity.

These are bold statements, and I know the sort of criticism which will be levelled against them. Here, for instance, is Newman, asseverating that to be present at extempore prayer is "to *hear* prayers —not to pray". Here is Stopford Brooke's protest against Nonconformist services: "I can't stand the extemporary prayers, like leading articles addressed to God. And when they are not like that . . . the inevitable personality in the style, which is so right in a sermon, is undesirable in a prayer". Above all, there is the dreadful, if hackneyed, story of the newspaper description of the public prayers of a certain popular American preacher as "the most eloquent ever addressed to a Boston audience".

Moreover—let it be freely confessed—extempore prayer can be as formal as any liturgy, and much more bald and arid and wearying. Oh the sufferings inflicted on patient congregations by the sacrosanct second prayer in our services! Stories are told of its lasting for twenty minutes—think of it! And even worse than its frequent interminable length is its all-too-common dreariness. No leading article in a newspaper, insufferably meandering through columns of solid print, beginning nowhere and ending at the same place, is more portentously heavy and uninspiring than many a pulpit prayer.

Again, the great demerit of our ordinary "plain" service is that the members of the congregation are to such an extent shut out from participation. Beyond question there is much in Newman's distinction between praying and hearing prayers. The outstanding advantage of liturgical methods is that they afford the worshippers a definite share in worship. Our extempore form of service grievously fails in this respect, and here is perhaps its most serious defect.

Add to all this the enormous responsibility (crushing, when it is realized) which it throws on one man, in seeking to voice the spiritual aspirations and needs of a number of others; and the corollary that the tone and atmosphere of the service is so much at the mercy of the mental mood and even of the physical condition of the one man concerned; and the result is a formidable indictment of "free prayer".

But while recognizing to the full the undoubted advantages which a liturgy affords, this paper is not a plea for liturgies. And still less —to adduce a Nonconformist instance—for the old custom of "morning prayer" as sanctioned for his followers by John Wesley. Wesley's revised version of the Church of England morning service is still in use in some of the churches of Methodism, but the number is now a very small one, and probably steadily growing less. And one cannot help thinking that Methodism has shown a sound judgment in abandoning this particular form. It is too long; it is frequently archaic in its language; some of its statements are indefensible in the light of modern knowledge; and it was framed for an order of society which no longer exists. Apart from the number of expressions in it which are, on various grounds, open to criticism, the general tone of the "incomparable liturgy" (as it used to be called) is out of harmony with the temperament of the Methodist people, and with the genius of Methodist worship—as of Nonconformist worship generally.

If a liturgy there must be, something more homely, more adapted to present conditions, less stereotyped, and certainly briefer, is required—something more along the lines of the *Book of Congregational Worship,* published several years ago by the Congregational Union, to mention one of many excellent manuals which have appeared in the last decade or so. This helpful and suggestive publication gives ten "orders of worship", two for each of the Sundays in the month. In this way variety and comprehensiveness are ensured, and the monotony of the Anglican liturgy, with its repetition of the same prayers and the singing of the same canticles every Sunday, is avoided. There is much to be said for the claim that along these lines a good deal might be done for the improvement of our Nonconformist services in dignity, devotion, and helpfulness.

But still, after all is said that can be said in criticism of the obvious defects of our usual method of Free Church worship, and in recommendation of prescribed forms, the fact remains—or so it seems to the present writer—that, as was said at the beginning of this paper, "free prayer" at its best is preferable to any liturgy. The present growing use of liturgies is not altogether a good sign, and needs to be carefully watched. The wisest road to take seems to be a fuller exploration of the possibilities of our ordinary procedure, with its decided and incontestable advantages of spontaneity and adaptability.

A few years ago Prof. C. Anderson Scott made some interesting and impressive remarks on the historical associations and comparative merits of the extemporary and liturgical modes of public devotion. He pointed out that both these methods—that observed by the Free Churches with scarcely any exception, and that followed by the Anglican and Roman Churches—are very ancient. Both date from

Old Testament times. Their roots can be traced back to early Judaism, and their development can be followed in the sacred books of pre-Christian days.

Prof. Scott went on to say that anyone who lived in Jerusalem at the time of Christ had the choice between the two before him. There was the Temple service, magnificent and ornate, with all the external adjuncts of ritual and æstheticism. There was also the other type, the worship of the Synagogue, which, as far as its form was concerned, was very like the ordinary Free Church mode of worship to-day—simple, homely, and untrammelled. He continued:

> It is a remarkable fact that there is no recorded instance of our Lord Jesus Christ being present at one of the Temple services, while references to His presence at Synagogue worship are frequent. Of course, it cannot be asserted that He never went to the Temple services; but this at least is certain—that, whenever He had opportunity, in the villages of Galilee or in the towns of Judaea, He betook Himself to the Synagogue.

Some recent words of Dr. T. W. Manson may be quoted to the same effect[1]:

> While in the Synoptics we have frequent mention of His partaking in the worship of the Synagogue, we have no record that He took any share in the liturgy of the Temple.

With this in view, those of us who love and cling to a plain form of service have less reason than ever to apologize for our preference. As Prof. Scott observes:

> There can surely be no ground for depreciating on the ground of its character, its type, or its form, that kind of worship which our Lord found satisfactory for Himself. What we have to do is to learn to understand it and to use it.

"To learn to understand it and to use it". That is the wisdom of the situation. That is the "way out" for us at present. We Nonconformists are not likely to do much good by the introduction of liturgical forms. That is not our *métier*—and we shall be well advised to recognize it. Probably all we shall accomplish along these lines will be, once we have created a liking for this sort of thing, to send our people to places where it is done more adequately and impressively. Our Nonconformist contribution to the re-united Christendom of the future will be stultified if we proceed in this direction.

Our task is to emphasize the prophetic rather than the priestly conception of religion and worship, the dynamic rather than the static, the ideals of the Synagogue rather than those of the Temple. That is our *raison d'être,* and so long as we have a separate existence —which will probably be for some time yet—we shall best serve the interests of the Kingdom of God by being true to it. And after we

1 *Congregational Quarterly,* January, 1933, p. 18.

are re-united—if and when the time comes—the worth of our witness will be the more clearly seen.

Let preachers and people alike—the former especially, though the latter also have their vital part to play—concentrate on a resolve to develop and make the very utmost of our ordinary form of service, with its warmth and homeliness and simplicity and spontaneity. So shall we best fulfil our calling, and what we lose in dignity and decorum (it need be very little) will be more than made up in immediate effectiveness, and in permanent contribution to the age-long outworking of the eternal purpose of God.

YOUNG PEOPLE AND CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

By the Rev. E. W. Coltman, B.D.

For over eighteen years I have been working a scheme of Young People's Church Membership, and I am confident it is one of the most useful tasks in which I have been engaged.

Membership classes are held once a month, one for those under 15 years of age, and another for those who are 15 or over. At the age of 12, children are received into the Church as "Junior Church Members," provided they love Christ and pledge their loyalty to Him. They are expected to be regular in attendance at Church and the Minister's Class; but they do not go to Church Meetings or partake of the Lord's Supper. At the age of 15, they are invited to become "Communicating Church Members" upon their making a more advanced confession of faith, though they do not yet attend Church Meetings. Finally, at the age of 18, they may become full Church Members, on the usual conditions.

Of course, spiritual fitness, and not age, is the governing factor at every stage, and some attend the Classes without becoming members of the Church. At each step the candidates' names go before the Church in the usual way, after the consent of their parents and Sunday School teachers has been obtained. They are "welcomed" at a special Communion Service at the conclusion of the Sunday School Anniversary, and this brings that festival to an inspiring climax.

There are many advantages of this scheme. It means that full Church Membership is delayed for young people until they understand its significance, and a small, but steady stream of those who have been thoroughly trained flows into the Church. A syllabus of over thirty talks on the Congregational Ideal of the Christian Church, dealing with the nature, the purpose, the government, the worship, the membership, the demands, the sacraments, the ministry, and the diaconate of the Church is used.

This scheme does not keep young people out of the Church till

they are ready to bear the responsibilities and receive the privileges of full membership; nor does it put them into a "Junior Church". It recognizes them as being part and parcel of the Church, and allows them to progress in it, step by step, according to their development, and to know the significance of what they are doing. Surely Baptism demands some such system as this for its completion, and the greatest work we can ever do for our young people is so to watch over them that they may never wander from the Kingdom of which Jesus declared little children to be members.

The scheme is a means of linking together the Church and the Sunday School, making it easier for scholars to pass from the latter into the former, and giving the teachers a definite goal to keep constantly before themselves and their scholars. It really supplements the teaching of the School, providing, as it were, a kind of secondary education for the young people.

Not its least value is the fellowship that it creates between the minister, the teachers, the parents, and the children. The minister learns to know his young people intimately, and can exercise constant watchfulness over them throughout the whole period of adolescence, and should there be any arrest or retrogression in development, he is able to give guidance.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

GEORGE MOORE.

The Life of George Moore. By JOSEPH HONE. Gollancz. 15s.

Epitaph on George Moore. By CHARLES MORGAN. Macmillan. 5s.

Muslin. Memoirs of My Dead Life. Conversations in Ebury Street. The Ebury Edition of the Works of George Moore. Heinemann. 5s. each.

A few months ago, reviewing Mr. James Whitall's *English Years,* I said :

> Mr. Whitall arrived [in England] with that absurd regard for George Moore which was the rage for a time : he collaborated with him, and then, with characteristic peevishness, Moore refused to allow the book to be published. The account we have of Moore may justify the description "illustrious Irish prosateur"; it certainly justifies Mr. Whitall in referring to his "absurdity, egotism, and general impossibility"; the description of Moore's encounters with Walter Raleigh and John Galsworthy are sufficient in themselves.

Shortly afterwards the Ebury edition of Moore's Works began to appear, and then came Mr. Joseph Hone's authorized biography, and I felt I must make an effort to write about Moore. I confess that I shirked the task, in part because Moore had always seemed to me an extraordinarily unpleasant person—I thought about him last quarter when I called Samuel Butler "about the most odious person in the history of English letters"—and in part because I was aware that I should be writing without that background of knowledge which gives confidence. Were the subject Mark Rutherford, say, I should be much happier, both because I have a feeling akin to affection for him, and because I am not without some acquaintance with the nineteenth century Nonconformity which produced him and with his *Weltanschauung.*

Anyhow the nettle must be grasped, and here I am, having read during the last few weeks the works mentioned at the head of this article and sundry others of Moore's writings, and now being ready to set down frankly the impression made upon me. I begin with another confession, which will no doubt confirm some in their conviction concerning the abysmal ignorance of editors in general : here it is in black and white—not until now had I read *Esther Waters.* And when I read it I was even more surprised than readers will be at my ignorance, for I cannot understand why writers against gambling have not brought it to my notice scores of times. *Esther Waters* will, I imagine, be alive long after more pretentious works that bear Moore's name are forgotten : it is simple, unvarnished realism—horrible in its description of a maternity ward—and it is alive. Moore knew all about horse-racing and stables at first hand, probably more than any other author, not excepting Nat Gould : *Esther Waters* is a tract showing the calamities which come to all who fall a prey to the betting craze. As written from the inside, by one who made no pretence at religion, it is excellent propaganda. It can now be obtained for sixpence : I recommend the Anti-Gambling League to disperse copies far and wide.

George Moore was born at Moore Hall in County Mayo in 1852. He died in Ebury Street in 1933 when he was held by some to be the G.O.M. of English letters, and the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, was

one of those who attended the funeral. His biographer had no easy task, for Moore wrote many autobiographical works, and had no hesitation about altering the facts when it suited his purpose. Mr. Hone says "he often displaced events in his autobiographical narratives". As a schoolboy he was hopeless, especially at spelling. Indeed, the bit of his writing which most appeals to me is a letter to his father at the age of 13:

> My dear Papa, I did not wilfully disobey your commands about writing you three pages of note paper. I could not do it it was quite impossible for me to do it every day if you will only try it for a week or two you will find it more difficult than you expect just you write me three pages every day and you will soon get puzzled about [what] you would say to fill up the three pages. Keep my pocket money if you will but dont keep me here during the vac I am sure that if I could only see you half an hour that I could convince you that I could not writ that letter of three pages besides my writing is much smaller than yours and I write much closer together than yours this letter would fill up twice as much space if I write wider apart I have made a great deel of improvement in spelling since midsummer do not be cross with me any more I will soon know how to spill perfectly the wood cocks must have been plentiful for you to shoot so many I am sure you will change your mind and take me home next summer just you try and write a letter every day and you wont find it so easy
>
> I remain yours
>
> George Moore.

Mr. Hone does not make it clear whether Moore ever learnt to spell; probably not. Certainly when he was 24 his letters were ill-spelt and badly punctuated, and in 1914 he refers to a "prespeterean" (shades of John Knox!).

When he came of age he went to Paris, and for some time thought of himself as a painter. In his autobiographical writings he makes the most of the people he met in the artistic and literary world. One never knows what is fact and what is fancy when handling Moore. He always liked to think of himself as French, and it is interesting to try to dissect him into his Irish, English, and French components. He settled in London and turned his hand to plays and poems, and his first novel *A Modern Lover* appeared in 1883. Already some features were evident which were to mark all his future life and work. In Mr. Hone's words:

> He hero-worshipped, used and then dissected this enchanting youth—a not unusual progression in his relations with men . . . .
>
> The way he talked about women was French rather than English. For the *Boulevardier* of the eighties it was highly creditable to be known as *un homme à femmes* and few deprived themselves of the pleasure of boasting of their conquests. The type may be followed in the plays and novels of the period. Variations from the truth, for which the listener made allowance, were part of the game.

Moore was always "boasting about his conquests", and was indignant if anyone suggested he was drawing the long bow; whether he kissed or not, he certainly told!

I do not propose to follow Mr. Hone in describing Moore's life. There was a spell in Ireland when he became a perfervid Irishman: he made absurd demands that his nephews should be brought up to speak Irish and revoked a will in their favour because this was not done to his satisfaction. Indeed in every way he treated his brother, Col. Maurice Moore, and Maurice's children very badly. Then he wiped the dust of Ireland from his

feet, and settled in London. *Esther Waters* made his name in 1894, and it was followed at intervals by novels, plays, criticism, and autobiographies. *The Brook Kerith* drew much attention in 1916 and *Héloïse and Abélard* in 1921. Realism had now been forsaken for the epic: as Moore said, with characteristic modesty, there were only three English epics—*Paradise Lost, The Brook Kerith,* and *Héloïse and Abélard.*

The student of Moore's writings finds his frequent revisions and his complete rejection of some early works baffling in the extreme: his readiness to incorporate chunks of material supplied to him by others raises more difficulties; publication in limited editions and everlasting polishing and repolishing also complicate the task.

What is to be the final judgment of Moore? And of his work? Is Mr. Whitall right about the man? The closer acquaintance offered by Mr. Hone's biography does not make me revise my earlier opinion. A man who, at the age of 25, calls himself "irreparably aesthetic", who says to his hostess, "I like this room: the wall-paper sets off my yellow hair", who constantly boasts about his reputation, and is almost invariably rude to his friends, does not attract. He might perhaps be forgiven for the "childish egotism", "the divine selfishness of the artist", which his friend, Professor Henry Tonks, said he possessed, but nothing in the world can excuse one who cries in a loud voice in order to be heard by an old friend who called, "No! No!; She's too old! She's too old!" Perhaps Tonks's words ought to be quoted:

> Intellectually Moore developed, he was learning to the end, but he was still as incapable as a child of four of grasping that there are other individuals who can make themselves unpleasant if he does not learn to curb his temper and his desires and to keep his feelings to a certain extent to himself. The world was his. Yet to learn to live alone is essential to those who wish to gather something of the mysteries of life; be he scholar, writer or artist he must develop something of the divine selfishness; this quality Moore certainly had, but he might have shocked fewer people if he had learned to make his selfishness less obvious.

Moore was, of course, quite impossible to work with: he had regard neither for collaborators nor for friends (he cut up a portrait which his friend Steer had painted for him) and he could indulge in "fine writing" about his mother's death. Mr. Morgan makes a valiant attempt to defend Moore's selfishness by inventing a Hyde for his Jekyll, an *Amico Moorini* who all through his life insisted on popping up and playing the very devil, but his generous championship is unconvincing. Altogether George Moore was an odious person: had he been a poor man obliged by stern necessity to engage in the rough and tumble of life, corners might have been rubbed off, and he might have become bearable: had he had to work for his living it might have made him a man. But he had money: he left over £60,000; he was "irreparably aesthetic" at 25; he lived entirely for himself—men and women alike existed merely to serve his ends. Such was George Moore.

But it will be said, if a man is an artist, if he make a contribution to letters or art, that which will be a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί, much may be forgiven. Is not that the case with George Moore? There are those who would answer in the affirmative without the slightest hesitation. I cannot do so. To me Moore seems best as a critic. Mr. Desmond Shawe-Taylor, who writes on "The Achievement of George Moore" in Mr. Hone's book, rightly calls his criticism "original, stimulating, beguiling, sometimes perverse, never dull". But even here Mr. Edmund Gosse is right in saying to

Moore, "You very often have something to say that's worth saying, but you are apt to spoil it by exaggeration".

It is not of his criticism, however, but of his novels and his style that the greatest claims are made. Mr. Hone has no doubt at all about Moore's genius and immortality: he says that for 20 years before he died his eminence, if not his supremacy, in English letters had been widely acknowledged. Mr. Charles Morgan, whose opinion is not to be despised, and who spent three years preparing a biography of Moore, declares:

> Twice George Moore re-created the English novel—first in 1894 when *Esther Waters* gave us our liberty and again ten years later when there began that series of tales, extending from *The Lake* through *The Brook Kerith* to *Aphrodite in Aulis,* in which we may discover if we will, a new cadence and discipline, a new reconciliation between the written and the spoken word.

Then we have the message sent to Moore on his eightieth birthday signed by Mr. Morgan and Mr. Humbert Wolfe among others:

> . . . who has written in *Daphnis and Chloë* a flawless translation, in *Esther Waters* a tale that marks a period in our literature, in *Hail and Farewell* an autobiography that has rank with Rousseau's, in *Héloïse and Abélard* a philosophical romance of supreme beauty, and in *The Brook Kerith* a prose epic unique in the English language. The uses of that language have been changed by your influence, as though in an ancient music you had discovered new melodies and rhythms that shall be in the air when young men in future time have stories to tell. You have taught narrative to flow again and anecdote to illumine it as the sun a stream. You have persuaded words and invention to sing new songs together that would have been heard, as those of an equal, by the masters upon whom the tradition of our literature relies . . .

Are these just words of kindness addressed to an old man, or are they absolute truth? Are they merely the expression of the adoration of an ardent group of disciples—among whom Mr. Hone includes Mr. David Garnett and Mr. John Freeman with Mr. Wolfe and Mr. Morgan—or is Moore really a master of English prose?

Is it presumption to say that the writers of the message to Moore seem to be turning the other cheek with a vengeance, and showing excessive kindness and charity to one who himself showed little? My own sympathies are with Mr. Bernard Shaw:

> . . . I read about thirty pages of *The Brook Kerith.* It then began to dawn on me that there was no mortal reason why Moore should not keep going on like that for fifty thousand pages, or fifty million for that matter . . .

The Dublin critic quoted by Mr. W. B. Yeats said the same thing in more picturesque fashion, describing Moore's sentences as "ribbons of tooth-paste squeezed out of a tube", and Mr. Yeats himself said, "charm and rhythm had been denied him". On the whole, *pace* Mr. Shawe-Taylor, Moore's style seems to me marked by "mannered artificiality", even as Pater's was. About it all there is the odour of midnight oil. When I read Mark Rutherford, I am impressed by the purity of his prose, but I am not eternally conscious of the workshop. Read an essay of Addison's and then three pages of Moore: the first seems natural, the sentences flow like a stream; the second seems mechanical, a directed stream through a garden which is continually being tended: the one is a landscape, the other a jig-saw puzzle, in which all the epithets seem fitted in—oh so carefully. If one can forget altogether the "mental distress" which one shares with

Mr. Ford Madox Ford in reading Moore, if one can escape the unpleasant sickly smell pervading all, even then the style is not convincing.

Perhaps Moore may be allowed to say the last word about his work: "Fifty years will wipe out all that I have written". I wish him a long sleep, not far from D. H. Lawrence—already almost forgotten, despite the foolish ravings of twenty years ago which now must seem as humiliating to those who indulged in them as they are incredible. That some of Moore's devotees will equally gladly repudiate their rhapsodies may safely be prophesied.

ALBERT PEEL.

P.S.—Since the above was printed four more volumes of Moore's works have appeared in the Ebury edition. They are: *The Brook Kerith, A Mummer's Wife, The Untilled Field,* and *Daphnis and Chloe.*

Mr. J. B. Priestley's latest, "A Chapter of Autobiography" *Midnight on the Desert* (Heinemann, 8s. 6d.) will be found interesting, though it will not add to the writer's reputation. At times it gives the impression of being a "pot-boiler", the writer showing economy in working in magazine articles and B.B.C. talks. On the point of leaving the ranch in Arizona where he and his family had spent the winter Mr. Priestley surveys the life of the American people. There is the same acute observation as was noted in *English Journey* and much good sense. This is specially noticeable in his remarks on the reading of young America at the present time, on psycho-analysis, and on "the now fashionable trick of explaining a thing by its roots and not by its fruits". There is many a good phrase, though it is doubtful if the majority of scientists have "the natural piety of men with a vocation". Some of Mr. Priestley's descriptive passages—of cowboys, of the Boulder Dam, and of listening to music in the St. George's Hall, Bradford—are very fine, but the best thing of all is the sketch of the writer's father. Mr. Priestley's excursus into the theory of time and a four-dimensional universe shows him in a new—and dazzling—light.

To judge from *Peace Offering* (Methuen, 5s.), Mr. A. C. Johnson seems to be younger than when he edited *Growing Opinions;* he is still young enough to be impressed by an appointment behind the stage and a luncheon in a club—he even passes on what the club-members near him were talking about! His method of writing a book is an easy one, some would say youthful in that regard too. He interviews Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Allen, Lord Lytton, Major-General Karl Haushofer (who reflects Hitler's views), Sir Edward Grigg, Mr. Beverley Nichols, Canon Sheppard, Mr. Aldous Huxley, Dean Matthews, and Mr. Noel Coward, and endeavours to draw from them their views on the subject of peace. It must have been rather a fascinating job, and the resulting volume is of great interest, though we cannot say that any definite leading results from it. Indeed, we cannot but feel that the outlook is gloomy indeed; statesmen, churchmen, men of letters, are all divided—there are about as many opinions as there are men —with Mr. Noel Coward's "there is no hope for the people" the most devastating of all. The world cries out for a prophet who will show mankind the way through the wilderness to the Canaan of Peace. Mr. Johnson should read his proofs more carefully: there are numerous misprints, even the poet "Spencer"; if he does these things in the green tree, what will he do in the dry?

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS.

SPAIN'S GREATEST LOSS.

In these baffling days of heart-break Spain appears to be losing everything —buildings and balance, measure and men; but in all the clash of arms and strife of blood and tears she has suffered no greater loss than when on December 31st of last year her greatest son, Miguel de Unamuno, died suddenly in his beloved Salamanca.

Ever since his entry on his great professoriate there, Unamuno has been the representative Spaniard, the one to whom all thinkers and workers in every department of life turned for enlightenment and inspiration. When he had been in Salamanca only four years Don M. Menéndez y Pelayo, the first Spanish man of letters of that day (1895), hailed him as "the most vigorous in thought and rich in promise of our young professors". Azaña, Ortega y Gasset, Caballero, Prieto, Besteiro, all the leaders of the great advance throughout the Peninsula which culminated in the bloodless revolution of 1931, have sat at his feet and have carried his teaching throughout the whole range of Spanish life and thought. His influence it is almost impossible to exaggerate. He has never traded in a coinage that did not ring true; on the contrary, his whole teaching has been that life is full of rational and spiritual forces and that only as these latter are realized and set free can progress be attained. The man who, according to Dante, *fece per viltate il gran rifiuto*[1], is a traitor to the race. By struggle, by anguish, by weakness, we must realize those values in life that matter. "Perchance infirmity itself may be the essential condition of what we call progress, and progress itself an infirmity"[2].

In *The Tragic Sense of Life*, one of his two major books, he poses the question which human life suggests to him: "the only true and vital problem is the problem of our individual and personal destiny, the immortality of the soul"[3]. For life was the only thing that interested him supremely; he had "a furious hunger to be, an appetite for the divine"[4]. He believed the divine to be possible and achievable, for he was a Christian in the finest and broadest sense of the word. "If my conscience be simply a flash of light twixt two eternities of darkness, then there is nothing more disgusting than existence"[5]. "If in any man you find faith in God united with a life of purity, of moral elevation, you will find it is not his belief in God which makes him good, but his being good, by God's mercy, which makes him believe in God. It is goodness which is the greatest source of spiritual clearsightedness"[6].

Unamuno was born in Bilbao in 1864, and he was a true Basque in his energetic personality and uncompromising individualism. In his eyes the man himself, the ego, was everything; the universe was to be apprehended in the individual soul. Thus he was satisfied to find continual conflict between his faith and his reason, for these should be ever at war. From that conflict springs the belief of the soul that despairs of any good save God, the only belief that matters. His faith must be based upon incertitude, upon doubt. "There is no hope more creative than that of a desperate man"[7]. In one of his greatest poems, *El Cristo de Velásquez*, he sits down before one of Velásquez' "Crucifixions" and in a soliloquy of some 3,500 lines thinks through the amazing paradox that through a broken, defeated

1 "made, because of his own lowness of mind, the great refusal" (*Inferno*, 3.60).
2 *Del Sentimiento Trágico de la vida*, 25. 3 *Ibid.*, 10. 4 *Ibid.*, 16.
5 *Ibid.*, 19. 6 *Ibid.*, 33. 7 *La Agonía del Cristianismo*, 47.

Son of Man, we "are made new men" and become certain of the ultimate goodness and beauty of God.

> Grant, Lord, that when at last I stagger forward from out this darksome night, I may enter into never-ending day; . . . O Son of Man, our human nature's full completeness, may my eyes, in that uncreated light which knows no term, be fixed on Thy eyes, my Christ, my gaze be lost in Thee, my Master![8]

It was no easy task essayed by the young professor in 1891, and for long years it seemed as though he were doomed to defeat. Yet bit by bit his attempt to fertilize the thought of his fellow-countrymen succeeded. His strenuous gospel of the meaningfulness of life, of the sublimity of all effort and work, however humble[9], gradually triumphed, and here and there throughout the Peninsula small centres of light, small groups of men seeking the truth in Christ, were to be met with. After about 1910, it was possible (a few years earlier it had meant imprisonment to the present writer) to buy and sell the Scriptures, profuse illustrations from which cram Unamuno's books from end to end. His home in one of the narrow shady streets of Salamanca became a shrine, a place of pilgrimage, for truth-seekers from all the nations. When men opposed him, he was not rebuffed, but rather he rejoiced. He cheerfully informed them that his function in life was to toss men into the Ocean we call God, in order that they might learn to swim. Spiritual strife he saw as an essential: let it be found in every university, in every counting house, in every home. "Only in Thy spiritual war can we have peace, win Thy kiss of greeting. Only in struggling for heaven, O Christ, can we mortals know peace"[10].

It is this conception of struggle between the things seen and unseen which animated his greatest book, *La Vida de Don Quijote y Sancho*. No such sustained effort to depict the Knight of the Melancholy Countenance and the fat little squire as emblems of faith and materialism has ever been written. In Quixote's knight-errantry he saw the true knight-errantry of the soul in a world of flesh and grovellings and selfishness. The book that "laughed Spain's chivalry away" became to him a great illustrated gallery of the conflict between the corporalities and the spiritualities. The key to life, as to Cervantes' story, he found in Quixote's exclamation, *"La religion es la caballería"*[11]—religion is knight-errantry, is the soul on the march, casting out all cowards and uniting in its ranks the brave and gallant seekers after truth from all lands and all ages. Behind the gimcrack and crazy notions of the knight, he saw the pure flame of faith, ever luminous, ever indomitable. As Quixote rode the wooden horse, surrounded with all the tawdry buffoonery of fireworks and crackers which the Duke's courtiers had devised, he cried to his squire: "There is no reason for fear, since He Who hath us in charge will render a good account of us"[12]; the words might have been the life motto of this most valiant knight-errant which the Basque people have ever produced. Particularly did Unamuno love to dwell on Quixote's answer to Sancho, when the latter urged that it was surely wiser to be the meanest monk than to be the most famous knight-errant: "We cannot all be friars, Sancho, and many and diverse are the paths by which God leadeth His own to His kingdom"[13].

And so Unamuno taught Spain what it was to rebel and became himself a saintly Christian rebel, the last and greatest of Spain's mystic heretics[14].

[8] *El Cristo de Velásquez*, 164.

[9] He always made great play with the well-known saying of Santa Teresa: *Entre los pucharos anda el Señor*, "the Lord is to be found walking among the kitchen pots".

[10] *Poemas*. [11] *Don Quijote*, II, 8. [12] *Don Quijote*, II, 41.

[13] *Don Quijote*, II, 8. [14] Mackay, *The Other Spanish Christ*, 147.

"I forge my truth, in spite of all opposition, by my faith and when it has thus been hammered out, my truth will tell and will stand alone and will outlive me and by it I shall live"[15]. Will it outlive him in these days, when Spain has become almost the battleground of the nations and when there is too much noise and bloodshed to listen to a simple utterer of truth, however valiant a man he may be? Who dare answer, "No"? The Government of republican idealists of 1931-33 may not return, but a time will surely come when the nations of Europe will return each to his own place, when Spain will once more be able in quietness to work out its own deliverance. Then it will be that seeds of thought sown by the beloved Rector of Salamanca will strike down into that blood-sprinkled soil. Then it will be that Unamuno will again be heard.

> Aim at heaven? No! Aim at the kingdom of God! And every hour of every day there shall rise from the lips of thousands of our people the petition: Thy Kingdom come! And God's kingdom will descend to our earth, for that kingdom is one of living men, not of corpses. And that kingdom for whose advent we pray daily, it is our task to create, not with prayers only, but also with hard struggle[16].

"The scenes of life", he once said, "pass before us as in a cinematograph show, but on the further side of time the film is one and indivisible". On that perfect, indivisible picture he now gazes; and his friends are glad. But he only attained his view by the hard struggle of a right gallant fighting man of faith.

SYDNEY H. MOORE.

15 *Vida de Don Quijote y Sancho*, 248. 16 *Vida de Don Quijote y Sancho*, 258.

LUTHERANISM: WHAT IS IT?

Whether inevitable or not, it is regrettable that, in the Church Controversy in Germany, division is being introduced into the Confessional movement by an assertion of the differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism. In this book[1], one whom I can claim as a friend, and for whom personally I have a high regard, writes, with an earnestness which does not always escape vehemence, an apology for Lutheranism.

His basic principle is that what constitutes the Lutheran Church a Church is its confession.

> In Germany, the homeland of the Reformation, the Church first became a confessional Church (p. 3).

This consciousness is being to-day recovered.

> We are beginning again to understand that all in German Protestantism which exists that is really ecclesiastically and theologically substantial, and genuinely church life, lives by this confessional inheritance.

From this principle he draws the conclusion that a religious community in which two confessions are recognized may be an alliance of churches, but cannot form one Church. He condemns without reserve the Evangelical Church of Prussia, the most influential of the territorial Churches, in which the Lutherans and the Reformed Churches with their confessions are united, as no Church, and as largely responsible for the destruction of the Lutheran Church in Germany. The newly constituted German Evangelical Church falls under similar condemnation. His opposition, it will be seen, is directed not only against State interference with the Church, but against

1 Hermann Sasse, *Was heisst lütherisch?* Zweite, vermehrte Auflage, 1936. Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München.

the very constitution of the Church which was brought into existence three years ago, and the Confessional Synod itself in so far as it acquiesces in such theological confusion within one Church. He desires an exclusively Lutheran Church which might be in alliance with an exclusively Reformed Church, but not one Church with it. This book is written to remove the confusion which the united Churches, and especially the Prussian, have introduced. He is not concerned with the abstract idea of Lutheranism or the application of the adjective Lutheran to any theologian, but with the concrete actuality. What is the Lutheran Church? To answer this question, he goes back, in the second chapter, to its antecedents, the Lutheran Reformation.

(2) Three misunderstandings need to be removed—the *heroic*, the *cultural*, and the *national* interpretation. Great as was Luther himself, his *personality* is not the sole factor to be taken into account; and he himself did not favour the Reformation movement's bearing his name. Still less is the Reformation to be treated as but part of the history of *culture* generally, which should be associated with the name of Erasmus rather than that of Luther, for the basis of all Luther taught was man's total corruption through original sin. No more warrant has the explanation that the Reformation was the protest of the German or Nordic people against the piety and the ecclesiastical system of Roman Catholicism. With a candour which in present circumstances required courage, he rejects this claim of an exaggerated nationalism. Without denying the intimate historical relation between the people and the Church, he asserts that the doctrine of the Schmalkald Articles would condemn not only

> the religion of the heathen ancestors, but even of the oldest German Christians—the faith of the greatest men of the people.

There follows this comprehensive anathema:

> Meister Eckart and Nicolas Cusa, Sebastian Franck and Jacob Böhme, Lessing and Herder, Kant and Fichte, Goethe and Schiller, Hegel and Schleiermacher, to mention only the greatest names which must here be mentioned, all these heroes of the German spiritual life, fall under the categorical judgment. That is all the old devil and old serpent, who made Adam and Eve enthusiasts (pp. 56-57).

There is evidently no lack of vigour or rigour in the author's antagonism to the recognition of any source of the Reformation except the one which he himself advances.

> The Reformation was an event in the history of the Church in the strict sense of the word, an event which the Church of Christ experienced in her history. For the Church of Christ, the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, is a reality in the world. As the Church of God, as the body of Christ, she is indeed hidden from our eyes, so that we can never prove her existence externally. But we may believe, that she is really there present, where the marks of the Church, the preaching of the Gospel and the sacraments of our Lord Jesus Christ are available (p. 60).

What was the content of this event? Many sought the Church's reformation; common to them all was the question, what could be done to make the Church again what God desired. Common too was the recognition of *norms* by which the Church must test itself and *commands* to be obeyed to secure reformation. Which, however, of the widespread reformations of the Church was the right one? How can the Lutheran and the Calvinistic reformations be distinguished? Reformation is in the

sense of the Reformed (Calvinistic) doctrine renewal of the Church by return to the Holy Scriptures. The Lutheran theology must deny that therewith the essence of that great event in the history of the Christian Church, which it describes as Reformation, is found (p. 65); such a reform does not itself make a church *evangelical*.

> To the *sola scriptura* there must, according to Lutheran theology, be added the therewith connected *sola fide* (p. 67).

While the ultimate authority of the Scriptures was emphasized as never before at the Reformation, this is not peculiar to it, for the Roman Catholic Church also recognizes that authority.

> In its essence the Lutheran Reformation is nothing else than the *rediscovery of the Gospel* (p. 68),

and this Gospel is the *doctrine of justification*.

> The real return to the Scriptures is first made possible by the new understanding of the Gospel.

Dr. Sasse has to recognize that Calvin also proclaimed this Gospel; and Reformed theologians would probably challenge the sharpness of the distinction which he here makes. It may, in my judgment, be conceded that the Reformed theology in its interpretation and application of the Holy Scriptures does tend to a *legalism* which obscures the Gospel; and that Luther regarded the teaching of the Scriptures too exclusively from the standpoint of this one doctrine. Both theologies have their characteristic excellences and defects. Luther is exalted as the *teacher* of the Church, and the Church as teaching in its creeds is exalted even over Luther himself, for the Lutheran doctrine is not identical with the teaching of Luther (p. 79). In his adherence to the Lutheran orthodoxy Dr. Sasse allows himself what seems to me at least an intolerable intolerance.

> The so-called "living religion" which one has in the modern world put in the place of dogmatic Christianity is an invention of the devil, as indeed the founding of religions is obviously a loved pursuit of the devil (p. 77).

Much of the teaching of Jesus which was concerned with how men lived and tested men by their fruits would seem to fall under this condemnation. For the first, uncorrected *Augustana* it is claimed that "it is taken out of the Word of God and is firmly and well grounded in it" (p. 81).

(3) In the third chapter, dealing with the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Dr. Sasse repudiates the charge that the Lutheran Reformation was responsible for the destruction of the unity of the Church in the West. Its aim was to preserve the unity and the continuity of the *Una Sancta,* and only to purge it from the corruptions and perversions of the Roman hierarchy; separation was forced upon it, and not desired by it. Next he seeks to meet the charge that

> we Lutherans overvalue our Reformation, in so far as we see in it *the* Reformation of the Church and in our Church *the* Church of the Reformation (p. 92).

This reproach he seeks to meet first by insisting that, as at the Reformation the vital issue was the *truth,* the form which the Churches assumed was necessarily *confessional,* bearing witness to the truth as each apprehended it. So the Lutheran Church began; not only was it the first to offer a confession, the *Augustana,* but for it that confession has a crucial importance as for no other church its confession has. Where has the Gospel been purely confessed? The Calvinistic and the Lutheran Churches have

so much in common in rejecting any other source of truth than the Scriptures that the issue may be narrowed down to the question : need they be separated from one another? This is the question to which the author next addresses himself in seeking to meet the reproach against the Lutheran Church. He affirms that the differences between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches are so vital that the common Protestant principles could not justify any compromise in what is distinctive of it. Its attitude to Roman Catholicism was different from that of the Reformed Churches, because it did not aim at forming a new Church in accordance with the Scriptures, but only at purifying the one holy apostolic Church from its perversions; it does not regard itself as compromising with the Roman Catholic Church, or as failing to carry out the Reformation thoroughly. Its doctrines of the Gospel, Faith, the Church, Justification and Predestination, the Incarnation and the Real Presence are so entirely different that it is no narrow-heartedness but only fidelity to conscience which compels it to maintain its opposition to Calvinism, because Calvinism recognizes the Law alongside of the Gospel, conjoins obedience with faith, asserts that there is a divinely prescribed polity for the Church, and does not subordinate the doctrine of predestination to that of justification by faith, as Lutheranism does : "He who believes in Christ may also believe that he is elect" (p. 151). What must be regarded as the most crucial difference is found in the doctrine of the Incarnation, and the doctrine of God involved. For Lutheranism, the finite can receive the Infinite, God can fully become man; and the Incarnation is so continued that the glorified body of the Risen Lord is present *in, with*, and *under* the elements in the Lord's Supper. The Calvinistic *spiritualization* seems to the Lutheran a denial of the reality of the Incarnation.

Three sentences will show the contrast :

> While the Reformed doctrine is anxiously concerned so to understand the Incarnation of the Son, that time and eternity, history and super-history in every case touch one another, but in no way whatever get mixed, the Lutheran Church confesses that in the Incarnation God has really entered into humanity, eternity into time, the Infinite into the finite . . . . The Incarnation therefore means not only a turning-point of history, which divides time into a time before and a time after Christ, but also it means a change in the being of the eternal Son (p. 156).
>
> Christ is not only in accordance with His divinity omnipresent, but also His glorified human nature shares in this omnipresence (p. 157).

After dwelling so much and so uncompromisingly on differences, Dr. Sasse goes on to affirm Lutheranism's loyalty to the *Una Sancta*. Because Lutheran Confessionalism is as he has presented it, "it is consistent with the breadth of a genuine oecumenical disposition" (p. 164). One evidence he offers is that the Lutheran Church has never carried on a propaganda to win converts from the other Churches.

> The unity of the Church consists in this, that she has *one* Lord, the Christ truly present in His Word and His Sacrament. The unity can appear in the historical form only in this, that we with one mind confess this *one* Lord and the *one* truth of the Gospel (p. 169).

Thus he makes *one* confession the sufficient, yet necessary, condition of manifest unity.

(4) So important for all Christendom is the Church situation in Germany, not only as regards the relation to the State, but as regards the weakening of the common front by the stress being now laid on the differences of

doctrine in the Churches, that this book demands and deserves serious study. Its bearing also on the prospects of the reunion of the Churches, more immediately on the discussions at the Faith and Order Conference in Edinburgh this August, enhances its importance. We must recognize and respect the intense sincerity of the author's convictions, and his genuine desire to deal fairly with the conflicting convictions of others. Whether the Reformed Churches could accept his representations as accurate or generous is another matter. To me, who have allowed myself to be more influenced than he has by modern scholarship in modifying the dogmatic authority of the Holy Scriptures, and by modern philosophy as regards the metaphysical formulation of doctrine, the differences do not seem to be quite insurmountable, at least not great enough to justify insistence upon them, when a common conflict is being waged. Well as Dr. Sasse has discharged his task, so that his book can be recommended as a competent representation of Lutheranism for to-day, yet I wish he could see with me that there is still something better to be done—the discovery under the Spirit's guidance of the larger truth beyond all these differences.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

The Divine Imperative. By EMIL BRUNNER. Translated by OLIVE WYON. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

Our Faith. By EMIL BRUNNER. Translated by J. W. RILLING. Scribners. 5s.

We very warmly welcome *The Divine Imperative,* and congratulate the Lutterworth Press on its courage in publishing so long a book, and the translator, Miss Wyon, on the skill with which she has rendered Brunner's German into lucid and readable English. But we wish that the German title had been retained, for *The Command and the Ordinances* (*Das Gebot und die Ordnungen*) better sums up the approach and method of this book.

The German original was published nearly five years ago. Since then the European scene has changed, and Dr. Brunner not unnaturally feels that, were he writing now, although he would not alter the substance of the book, he would place "the emphasis rather differently especially in the chapters dealing with the problem of the State". But the book is still relevant to our modern needs. When we read it in its German form we thought it the most valuable of all the books on Christian Ethics we had read, and that judgment has been confirmed as we have read the translation. We have in English many books on Christian Ethics, whilst in Germany most of the great theologians have written on Christian Ethics. But somehow Protestant books on this subject tend to lack coherence. They are of value in that they express the moral judgments of keen and cultivated Christian minds, but they suffer for the most part from two defects: their teaching is ill-related to the Protestant conception of the freedom of faith; their authors are out of touch with life as it is lived by those in the rough conflict of the world. The confusion of our age is not lessened but increased by the facile pronouncements of ecclesiastics and popular preachers who confidently acclaim as "Christian" solutions of the complex problems of industry and politics which might be admirable in a world peopled only by saints and celibates but are irrelevant to the world we know —a world containing only sinful men and women. The Roman Church naturally claims the right to legislate for its members on moral matters. Protestant Churches may not thus turn the Gospel into a law. Yet much Protestant writing and preaching on Christian Ethics is "Catholic" rather that Evangelical—concerned more with law than with Gospel.

Dr. Brunner remarks that, in spite of the many books on Christian Ethics written by men claiming to be "Evangelical" or "Protestant", "since the time of the Reformation no single work on *ethics* has been produced which makes the Evangelical faith its centre". It is this lack which he seeks to supply.

The reviewer gave a brief account of this book in these columns and a much longer description of it in *The Expository Times* more than four years ago. As it is a long book of more than seven hundred pages, it may be well to give a short statement of its method. It opens with a statement of the problem; this to the reader unfamiliar with philosophy may be the most difficult and least attractive part of the book. But, if he will persevere, he will find that the book is simple in its central conception, though in expression it would gain by greater conciseness. Justification is by grace alone. But the faith demanded is not passive acceptance. "Faith is obedience, just as obedience is only genuine when it is faith". God has given us but one command—to love Him. And this love of God includes the love of man; "to be laid hold of by His will, to be freely obedient to His will, means to love our neighbour".

> Where our neighbour is concerned there are no isolated "duties", but only the *one* duty—to do to him what the love of God wills should be done to him here and now This is why God is always bidding us do some particular thing, something which cannot be done at any other time, something quite new. God's Command does not vary in *intention,* but it varies in *content,* according to the conditions with which it deals. The error of casuistry does not lie in the fact that it indicates the infinite variety of forms which the Command of love may assume; its error consists in deducing particular laws from a universal law in ever greater and more scrupulous detail; thus it is wrong because it turns the Divine Command into a Law, and then inevitably into the sum-total of all laws. Casuistry tries to imprison concrete life within a net of "cases" as though all could be arranged beforehand, and thinks it can do this by means of an exposition of the law which is modelled on the lines of a legal code, applied in a similar manner through derivation from a supreme principle. Love, however, is free from all this predefinition, for it means being free for God, "relaxed as the arrow in the hunter's bow" (Thurneysen), in the Hand of God, and therefore free for our real neighbour. Love is "occasionalist". She does not know the Good beforehand—and by this very fact she is bound both to God Himself and to her actual neighbour.

What love (*Agape*) is, we know finally only in Christ's Cross. That command of love has to be obeyed in the Divine Ordinances. (We prefer "Ordinances" to Miss Wyon's word "Orders" as a translation of *Ordnungen.*) We are not Robinson Crusoes; we live, and are meant to live, in a community. First and most fundamental is the community between the sexes. There are also the communities of industry, of the State, and of the Church.

> With the exception of the Church, they are all independent of faith, and of the love which flows from faith. They exist because of the psycho-physical nature of man.
>
> Faith finds these forms of community already present, or rather the believer finds himself and others placed within this framework. Therefore he has to come to some kind of understanding with them. How he is to do this constitutes the most difficult problem of Christian ethics, precisely because they are so foreign to the nature of faith,

> and because they are based upon a standard of law which is totally different from that which is known by faith.

All these forms of community conceal within themselves Divine Ordinances. These Ordinances—

> in spite of the fact that in their present form (constantly changing with the fluctuations of history) they witness quite as much to human sin—and are indeed deeply influenced by sin—as to the Divine Creation—have been given by the Creator in order to make it possible to maintain human life within them as "life in community", or at least, that such "community" may be their aim.

That, then, is the Christian's problem. He has, as best he may, to work out the one command of love in those forms of community which, though originating in the Divine Ordinances, are yet known to him only as perverted by sin.

> We are summoned at all times to take our place humbly and gratefully in the spirit of service, within the actual social environment in which our life is placed, and in it we are to do the duties it requires as the work God has given us to do; at the same time, we are summoned to protest against the lovelessness which it contains, and to seek to realize a better order. But it is impossible to lay down once for all what it means to combine these two attitudes. All that we can do is to discover this anew in every fresh historical situation, at the particular place where our lot is cast; hence all the general ethical considerations of the Christian moralist—as he views the concrete situation—can never produce any "laws" for conduct; he can merely offer occasional suggestions.

The remaining sections of the book contain Brunner's own "suggestions". They are the suggestions of one who knows life as it is for many in this troubled modern world. His treatment of such problems as divorce and birth control is entirely free from the inhumanity which has marked the utterances of some ecclesiastics. On the economic struggle he writes :

> A Christian ought not to allow himself to be prevented from joining the ranks of a certain opposition group because he sees that even in this opposition, which wishes to fight for the new order, there are injustices and human failings, nor because he perceives that within these ranks there is either indifference, or even open hostility, to Christianity and the Church. For here he is concerned not with the action of the Church, but with the action of the body of citizens as such, where there is no question of anybody's religious creed. Almost without exception the worst that could befall would be the formation of "Christian" parties; for this would bring in a disastrous confusion between the spheres of Church and State. "Christian" political parties are in harmony with the style, and legitimate upon the ground, of Roman Catholicism; for here the Church as such has a political and economic programme. The Protestant Church as such has no programme; if she were to have one she would already have become "Roman" at heart. The curse of the betrayal of the Name of Christ broods over the "Christian" social organization for this struggle. We cannot tack this Name on to any of our little political banners . . .
>
> It is unfair and absurd to require a Christian business man to conduct his business "according to the laws of the Sermon on the Mount". No one has ever conducted business on these lines or ever will; it is

against all the rules of business itself. The "office" of a business man belongs to a specific order which is not that of the relation between one person and another. On this point the business man himself, as well as his critic, ought to be quite clear; he ought to know that, even if he tries to be a just and upright business man, he is still very far from being a "Christian" business man, but that even his business activity is a bit of this wicked world; therefore those who pass judgment upon him ought not to presume to judge him. But, on the other hand, the seriousness of his Christian life must manifest itself in the fact that he fights with all his power against the evil autonomy of his official work, and that he tries again and again to break through it, which means that he treats the people with whom he has to do in business as his neighbours, to whom he owes love, and that he conducts his business as a service to the community.

Of the State he writes as sombrely as of industry:

> God wills that there should be nations with various forms, with one kind of unity which will include them all, and that there should be a humanity which effectively manifests their unity.

But the State is an ordinance

> which is also determined by the fact of sin. The historical picture of the actual life of the State corresponds to this fact. Every State represents human sin on the large scale; in history, in the growth of every State the most brutal, anti-divine forces have taken a share, to an extent unheard of in the individual life, save in that of some prominent criminals. In the State we human beings see our own sin magnified a thousand times. The State is the product of collective sin.

In the section on the Church, Brunner writes much from which Free Churchmen will differ. But we do well to heed his warning against the temptation to try to win the world by our adaptability.

> False churchmanship, or clericalism, does not consist in an excessive concern for the visible Church, but it is churchmanship which lacks any real foundation because it seeks that foundation in itself. In other words, it is a churchmanship which, since it does not spring from a concern to proclaim the true Gospel, finds its dynamic—which it certainly possesses—in secular motives and ideas. Once again the Church presents to the world the painful spectacle of an institution which is being carried along by the great forces of the world and of the age, even where its independence is most vigorously proclaimed. The Church allows herself to be carried along by all kinds of "waves" of mighty but quite uncontrollable forces, of varied origin. She has perceived the collective situation and she allies herself with all kinds of elemental forces. Her great desire—and this is the time-honoured scandal of Protestantism—is to keep pace with the times. Yesterday she was Idealist in outlook, to-day she is collectivist; yesterday she was revolutionary, to-day she is conservative; yesterday she was international, to-day she is nationalistic. But this Church is sadly out in her reckoning. When the Church tries to be modern she always arrives too late, and the world—rightly—is only amused by her "modernity" . . .
>
> The great danger of the Church, either on a large or on a small scale, is always that of the Grand Inquisitor, that is, its aspiring to be great, its desire to glorify itself. True evangelical insight, how-

ever, knows that the Church cannot be great either in doctrine or in love, save in so far as she forgets herself and remembers only the end for which she exists. The saying that "he who would save his life shall lose it" applies to the Church as well as to the individual. Just as faith seeks not herself but the Word of God, so also to the true Church the Church is not the main thing but the divine content which is entrusted to the weak fragile vessel. The watchword of genuine churchmanship is never "the Church", but always and only "Jesus Christ". The more earnestly this message points away from the Church to Christ the more the Church increases in real strength, even in strength to shape life and to serve the people.

It is impossible in a brief review to indicate the abundant riches of this book. We shall ourselves use it as the basis of a seminar on Christian Ethics for students in their leaving year. May we venture to suggest its suitability for discussion in Ministers' Fraternals? Much of the *malaise* in our churches is due to sentimental Utopianism which makes an impassable gulf between one day's preaching and six days' practice. The problem of Christian Ethics is the gravest and most urgent that we have to face. We may differ often from Brunner's concrete "suggestions". But we cannot afford to overlook his method and approach. Here we have a treatment of Christian Ethics which is Protestant and not legalistic, is based on principle and so not mere casuistry, and which, because it takes account of the sin of us all, is saved from the cruelty of a shallow optimism. We hope this book will be very widely read.

To English readers it oftens seems that if Continental theologians spent more time over the writing of their books, they would be able to say what they have to say in far fewer words. Thus the first half of Brunner's great book on Christian Ethics might have been clearer if more concise. That he can write both clearly and concisely is shown by his little book, *Our Faith*. Its thirty-five short chapters are models of compact expression. The book has been translated into many languages, including Japanese. We hope that in English also it will have an extensive sale. Here in short and simple form is Brunner's statement of what he conceives the Word of God to be.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Most Protestants are no longer suspicious of Roman Catholic books as once they were, and they are prepared to learn from them alike in dogmatic and moral theology, and in the lives of the Saints. From *St. Francis de Sales* (Sheed & Ward, 6s.), a translation of Dr. Michael Müller's *Frohe Gottesliebe*, much can be learnt in all these three fields. Readers will not regret the time they give to a work of this kind : it can bring blessing to the soul as well as enlightenment to the mind.

Admirably translated from the German by R. and E. A. Howe, Herr Josef Wentner's *Saul* (Rich & Cowan, 8s. 6d.) is a well-told story, though David and Michal often take the centre of the stage rather than Saul. The material was there to the writer's hand, and he has moulded it skilfully. A story of Bible times which we can recommend.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

For the missionary command does not run "Invite everyone to your Sunday services by the ringing of Church bells", but "Go forth into all the the world and preach the Gospel to *every* creature". The true shepherd of whom Ezekiel speaks does not wait until the sheep find their way back to him, but he goes after them into every chasm and byway. We preachers of the Church have no right to say "If they do not wish to hear our sermon on Sunday morning, that is their affair, we have done all that was possible". For it is nowhere written that this type of proclamation of the Gospel, which has become traditional, is the normal or the only warranted one, when it is a matter of experience that the majority of men no longer seek for it.

Emil Brunner, *The Church and the Oxford Group.*

From a letter of Henry Oxinden, 6th February, 1643.

I was at Arundell, where though I was in great danger, I was not so much afrayd as greived to see men of the same Religion, of the same Nation, so eagerlie engaged one against the other, as if they had beleft they had done Allmightie God good service in defacing his own image and destroying the workemanship of his owne hands. It was a great vexation to mee to consider that everie conquest added to the Kingdomes losse and everie losse to the ioy of the kingdomes enemies, and yett the consideration of this, nor of anie thing else, would abate the furie of those, who though they slight humane precepts, yet ought not to contemne divine exhortations, amongst which this is none of the least, to seeke peace and follow itt; which for my part I shall lay beefore my eies and apply unto my heart, being resolved Quantum in me est pacem cum omnibus habere.

Our blessed Lord and Saviour when hee came into the world Hee brought Peace into itt; when hee went out of itt, Hee bequeathed Peace as a legacy, and for mee, lett him for euer bee accursed who will refuse soe divine a gift, bequeathed by so heavenly a Father to the sonnes of God. *Feb.* 6, 1643.

Dorothy Gardiner, *The Oxinden and Peyton Letters.*

Giustizia e Libertà (an Italian *émigré* organ published at 21 rue Val-de-Grâce, Paris) occasionally procures and publishes the daily secret orders issued to the Fascist press by the Ministry of Propaganda. The list covering the period May 1, 1936, to July 7, 1936, appearing in the issue of July 17, 1936, indicates the scope of the Ministry's activity. The 86 orders issued in that period include injunctions against mention of the promulgation of a new constitution in Soviet Russia (better that the Italian people remain ignorant of a dictatorship's decision to provide a façade of representative government); against estimating how many soldier dead can be contained in the *"Ossario"* at Amba Alagi (that might reveal discrepancies between reported and actual casualties in the African campaign); against mention of unemployment in Italian Africa; against reporting discussions of the International Labour Office regarding conditions and hours of labour; against publishing articles or pictures tending to show the "fraternization" of Italians and Ethiopians or to exalt "racial hybridism" (*"Assoluta e netta divisione fra la razza che domina e quella che é dominata"*); against giving details of the successful strikes in France, *etc., etc.*

H. F. Armstrong, *We or They.*

The problem of the Church and society prompted me to distinguish in an essay on "Church and Humanistic Society" between a "manifest" and a "latent" Church. It was not the old Protestant distinction between the visible and the invisible Church which was to be discussed in that essay, but I was concerned with the differentiation within the visible Church. The existence of a Christian Humanism outside the Christian Church seems to me to make such a distinction necessary. It will not do to designate as non-churchly all those who have become alienated from the organized Churches and traditional creeds. My life in these groups for half a generation showed me how much latent Church there is in them: the experience of the finite character of human existence; the quest for the eternal and the unconditioned, an absolute devotion to justice and love; a hope which is more than any Utopia; an appreciation of Christian values; and a most delicate apprehension of the ideological misuse of Christianity in the Church and State. It often seemed to me as if the latent Church, which I found in these groups, were a truer church than the organized Churches, because its members did not assume to be in possession of the truth. Of course, the last few years have shown that only the organized Church is able to carry on the struggle against the pagan attacks upon Christianity. The latent Church has neither the religious nor the organized weapons necessary in this struggle, though their use threatens to deepen the chasm between Church and society. A latent Church is a concept belonging to the situation of border, and it is the fate of countless Protestant men of our day to stand on this border.

PAUL TILLICH, *The Interpretation of History.*

The poor drover, who approached the Reverend Robert Bruce, after sermon, during the minister's second exile in Inverness, desiring to learn the whole way of God and attempting to ensure the minister's good offices as his guide, by the irresistible bribe, "I'se gie ye twa coos, if you'll 'gree me and God", may not have been polished in his Biblical phraseology, but he certainly had the root of the matter in him, as far as appreciation of the Scripturally imposed necessity of a covenant between God and man was concerned.

DUNCAN ANDERSON, *The Bible in 17th Century Scottish Life and Literature.*

Of his [Calvin's] Trinitarian belief there was not the least doubt, as his teaching on the subject in the *Institutes* conclusively proves. Caroli retorted by asking them [Calvin and Farel] to join with him in assenting to the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds. Calvin refused. For him the Word of God, not the Apostles', the Nicene, the Athanasian Creeds, was the compelling authority for faith. "We have sworn the faith in the one God, not in Athanasius, whose Creed no true Church has ever approved."

MACKINNON, *Calvin and the Reformation.*

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.)

DICTATORS AND DICTATORSHIPS.

Dictators. By JACQUES BAINVILLE. Cape. 10s. 6d.

The Letters of Lenin. Translated and Edited by ELIZABETH HILL and DORIS MUDIE. Chapman & Hall. 15s.

"We or They": Two Worlds in Conflict. By H. F. ARMSTRONG. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

Anarchy or Hierarchy. By SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA. Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

To M. Bainville's publishers we award first prize as usual, and to the translator, Mr. J. Lewis May, a "highly commended", but the book itself will not add to its author's reputation. Bainville, whose *The French Republic, 1870-1935* was noticed last quarter, died before this translation saw the light. He was a Royalist whose politics coloured all that he wrote, not less so because he has the French clarity in conspicuous degree. Some of the sketches of dictators in Greece, Rome, and South America are very slight; others, like that on Cromwell, reveal his lack of knowledge; yet others, like those on the Russian Dictators, give a quite inaccurate picture of the achievements of the new *régime*. The best of them are those dealing with his own country—Richelieu, Louis XIV, Robespierre, and the two Napoleons—and that of Mussolini.

Books of origins always make a special appeal to us, and the translators and editors of Lenin's letters have rendered useful service to students. The letters are a selection covering the whole of Lenin's life, though there are only a few for the years when he was in power. The editors have done their work well, the chronological summaries at the heads of the sections being specially useful: their notes, however, are unduly sparing, and it would have been helpful if they had indicated which letters were written with the chemical preparation. Especially revealing are those dealing with propaganda conducted from abroad: the troubles of the revolutionary journalist, at home or in exile, are indeed many. The affectionate family letters afford a great contrast to some of the political ones, in which some characteristic notes are frequent:

> Down with all softheartedness! (1903).
>
> Altogether reject any reconciliatory moves and approaches, and begin a decisive war, a relentless war. . . . (1904).
>
> I hate Kautsky and at the moment I despise him more than any one: a beastly, rotten, smug hypocrite. (1914).
>
> We *do not at all oppose* political killing . . . but as revolutionary tactics, individual attempts are both impractical and harmful. (1916).
>
> What a swine that Trotsky is! (1917).

The word "devilish" often reappears, while in 1908 Lenin says:

> I cannot and will not talk with people who have begun to advocate combining scientific socialism with religion.

Lenin's view of the Russian people is also made clear, and it makes his achievement all the more remarkable :

> In such matters (the systematic working of a periodical) Russians are diabolically, unpardonably and incredibly slow.

Perhaps the most characteristic passage of all is in a letter dealing with the same subject in 1905, when we see both the organizing genius at work and Lenin's unwillingness to trust young people :

> A professional revolutionary must create in each place dozens of new links, entrust the whole work into their own hands under his supervision, teach them and pull them up, not by lecturing, but by work. Then he has to go to another place and after a month or two return to check up the work of the young substitutes. I assure you that there is among us some kind of idiotic, philistine, lazy fear of young people. I implore you : fight this fear with all your strength.

The common-sense side of Lenin's life is seen in his advice to his sister when in prison, recommending her to work hard, but to vary occupations "from translation to reading, from letter writing to gymnastics, from serious reading to fiction", and thus avoid the depression which comes under prison life. There are misprints on pp. 170, 259, 343.

One or two of the letters are of special interest to me in that they date from the time when Lenin used to work on the next seat to my own in the British Museum.

Mr. H. F. Armstrong's book is an American *exposé* of dictatorships. The antithesis in the title is Mussolini's, and Mr. Armstrong throws a searching light on the methods of the Duce and of his German *confrère*. How can democrats understand those whose scholars declare :

> We will never approach history impartially, but as Germans.
>
> The old idea of science based on the sovereign right of abstract intellectual activity has gone forever.
>
> We do not know of or recognize truth for truth's sake or science for science's sake.

Even sport to the Fascist is not what it is to others :

> The non-political, so-called neutral athlete is unthinkable.

How can we enter into relationships with men who break their own word when it suits their purpose, who talk peace and prepare for war? Mr. Armstrong recognizes the disadvantages of a democratic government in discussion with dictators, and emphasizes their failure in recent years. A thorough and disturbing essay.

Señor de Madariaga has made another very important contribution to the study of current problems. In the 16th century England, he says, showed that the issue between Protestantism and Catholicism was irrelevant to religious sanity, and by taking her own line saved the freedom of the world. The issue between fascism and communism is to-day "irrelevant to political sanity", and it remains to be seen whether the British Commonwealth, with the United States, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries, can save the world by reforming their public life without sacrificing either liberty or democracy. With this in mind Señor de Madariaga analyses liberal democracy, and shows how and where it has failed. He then proceeds to outline the principles and methods of a true democracy. His constructive ideas are worth stating in length :

1. That the finality of life is in man and not in the State.
2. That man's aim in life—individual experience—implies the greatest individual liberty possible.
3. That freedom of thought is as indispensable for the individual as for the State.
4. That inequality is natural and good, both for the individual and for the community.
5. That in functions the individual serves the State, while in values the State serves the individual.
6. That the functional State, *i.e.* the economic and financial State, must be organized as an efficient piece of machinery; but that, upon it, there must rise the moral and political State based on liberal and democratic principles.
7. That private initiative in economic matters is indispensable to liberty.
8. That the State has the right and the duty to set limits to both liberty and inequality, so that the more ambitious citizens do not become too powerful nor the more slothful too indigent.
9. That citizenship should be limited to active citizens carefully selected, and that the government should be an "aristocracy".
10. That the State has sovereignty as a matter of common sense.
11. That this sovereignty is limited in all that concerns war, and that the State has no right to require military service in wars contrary to the international law prevailing.
12. That the natural and necessary form of the State is that of a unanimous organic democracy, towards which all contemporary democracy must tend if our civilization is to be saved.

This summary will be sufficient to indicate how thoroughly and fruitfully the subject is tackled. Throughout there is frank criticism of democracy's shortcomings:

> Moreover, inequality implies at the lower end a danger limit—the much feared line of *necessity*—and necessity is an indispensable element both in collective and in individual life. This is a hard saying, and one which democracy does not like to hear. But the harm done to democracy by the lack of courage of its intellectual workers is incalculable.
>
> For it is evident, although it has been lamentably forgotten by liberal democracies, *that a government is always an oligarchy and ought to be always an aristocracy.*

The case against the absolute conscientious objector has never been more clearly stated; Señor de Madariaga, by the way, believes it would be a great help if there could be a universal register of world citizens ready to fight in just wars, but pledged not to fight in a war deemed by the Council of the League or the Hague Court to be unjust.

EDITOR.

The Promise of the Father. By R. H. MALDEN. Oxford Press. 8s. 6d.

From time to time we have referred in these pages to books by Anglican writers which leave us with a feeling akin to despair. Such a one is the Dean of Wells's *The Promise of the Father.* And what a fine book it could so easily have been! In the Preface the Dean explains that during a voyage of convalescence he began to look up and examine all the references to "the Spirit" in the New Testament. The sections of the book which embody this study are eminently useful, and there are wholly admir-

able Appendixes, notably that on "The Theory and Practice of Indulgences". The reader may wonder what this has to do with the subject of the book, and wonder will recur many times as he turns the pages; for somehow Dean Malden connects with his theme the need for restatement of Christian doctrine as well as Christian reunion.

It is the tone of the passages where the Dean discusses "what are known as the Free Churches" which makes us sick at heart. No doubt he intends to be tolerant and sympathetic, and has not the slightest intention of causing pain, but the lack of understanding is so marked that it cannot but give the impression of lack of charity. The "strain of arrogance" he finds in Calvin's *Institutes* seems to us much more pronounced in his own pages. In the pages devoted to Congregationalism there is not the slightest sign that the Dean has read any exposition of Congregationalism, and of course the works of Dale and Forsyth do not appear in the list of authorities. It will not be surprising, therefore, that

> there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that the principle which Congregationalism exists to vindicate must, if it be taken as the only formative principle in the Church, lead to the complete disintegration of the Christian religion.

And as for the Quakers—who represent "the lowest pitch of organization to which religion can be carried without ceasing to exist" and "have never aspired to be more than a semi-private sect"—they do not observe "His own sacraments", and if anyone neglects the Sacraments,

> his spiritual perspective will be faulty, and his spiritual judgement will become more and more untrustworthy.

The Dean is fond of referring to the greatness and the unique position of the Church to which he belongs. If all Anglicans had witnessed for their Lord like the members of this "small, self-contained, and exclusive sect" of Quakers what a different world we should have! The Anglican Church, it is interesting to learn,

> enjoys a degree of freedom which no other communion can rival. It can allow its sons a very large measure of intellectual liberty and encourage them to make full proof of their unique privilege,

and

> can by its history, tradition, and character offer a scope for them which no other communion can rival.

Not "bound irrevocably to doctrinal statements of a particular period", like the Lutherans and the Methodists,

> the Church of England is by history, traditions, and circumstances uniquely fitted to be the home of such experiments. It is in itself the boldest experiment in religious liberty which the world has seen yet.

Enthusiastic belief in one's own Church is always welcome, but "the fulfilment of the promise" will only be realized when all Christians are generous in recognizing the merits of those of other Churches. Dean Malden, however, always finds it difficult to be fair to those from whom he disagrees; we hold no brief for the Freudian psychology, but is it necessary to say that the data

> on which it is based [are] apparently for the most part observations conducted in the slums of Budapest?

And so we could go on—about laymen who teach religion in schools, about the priest's priority and superiority to the prophet, about baptism. "That they all may be one"—all Christians desire that the prayer of Jesus may be realized, but *non tali auxilio*.

EDITOR.

The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism. By ADOLPHE LODS. Kegan Paul. 25s.

Those who have used Prof. Adolphe Lods's *Israel* will certainly want to have its continuation, translated (as before) by Professor S. H. Hooke. It is unfortunate, and it seems unnecessary, that the price of the English translation should be about three times that of the French original. The two volumes together are the best books in English for a brief outline of the history and a fuller treatment of the religious development within it, in each period. Prof. Lods knows all that is to be known about the latest discoveries in archæology and the latest discussions of critical problems, but he keeps the emphasis on the central things. He recognizes, *e.g.*, that the great prophets shared with their forerunners in abnormal psychical features, but he sees fully the profound change wrought by their new conceptions of God and man. On all the great questions raised by the period under review he reaches a clear and tenable conclusion, even if a different view be taken by the reader on points of detail. I find his attitude to *Hosea, e.g.*, rather unconvincing, including his omission of *c.* 14 from Hosea's oracles. Nor do I think that his attempt to place *Habakkuk* in the middle of the exile is any more satisfactory than that which dates him somewhere about the battle of Carchemish (605 B.C.). On the other hand, the fairness and fullness with which Prof. Lods considers the arguments of those from whom he differs, and the sanity and balance of his judgments in general, are very attractive features of his work. A notable example of this is to be seen in his treatment of Ezekiel, both the man and the book. As to the latter, he still stands for the essential unity; he thinks that the peculiar literary contrasts are sufficiently explained by the "heterogeneous tendencies" of Ezekiel's personality. Against some recent arguments, he maintains, as I think rightly, that the real authors of the post-exilic revival in Judaea were the Jews from Babylonia.

Altogether, this book, with its predecessor, is one to which the student of the Old Testament may most safely be directed for a comprehensive and highly competent survey of his whole subject, full of stimulating and fully documented material.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Origin of the Galatian and other Epistles. By LLYNFI DAVIES. *Western Mail*, Cardiff & London. 5s.

The Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews in their Historical Setting. By F. J. BADCOCK. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

The difficulty of equating Paul's visits to Jerusalem as recorded in *Gal.* and *Acts* is well known. The writer of the first of these books maintains that the "Galatians" visits were private, and that the second of them (*Gal.* 2) is therefore neither the famine visit of *Ac.* 11 nor the council visit of *Ac.* 15. It was undertaken, as Paul says, "by revelation", and it is referred to in *Ac.* $18^{21b\text{-}22}$, verses which refer to a later time and have no connexion with the voyage of vv. 18-21a. "The church" in v. 22 is Jerusalem, not Caesarea. Paul is at Ephesus (the "14 years" of *Gal.* 2^{1} brings us to about A.D. 56). It is heavy going (because of Jewish opposition), and Paul has a "revelation" that it would ease matters if he and Barnabas could be recognized as "Apostles of the Mother Church" instead of merely apostles of Antioch! Barnabas agrees, and going to Jerusalem with Titus, they receive the desired *imprimatur*. Henceforth Paul and Barnabas are to confine their operations to the Gentiles, while Peter, John, and James would evangelize "the circumcision" — beyond as well as in Palestine. (So, though James stays at headquarters, Peter goes to Antioch, then to Galatia *I Pet.* 1^{1}—and Babylon; John, after writing *1 Jn.*, preaches to the Jews of

Asia—*vide* the seven letters of *Rev.* 2f.—he has a day in Patmos *en voyage,* and writes *2 & 3 John* when on furlough at Jerusalem, the "elect lady" being his wife and *3 Jn.*[9] the church in Ephesus. Then he returns to Ephesus, finds Paul's epistle — written from prison in Caesarea — and finishes his gospel.)

Paul and Barnabas meanwhile have gone to Antioch. And after the scene with Peter, they (Barnabas after being "carried away", *Gal.* 2[13], is apparently carried back) go on to Galatia (neither North nor South) and evangelize the Gentiles, and then Paul goes to Ephesus. But some opponent (*Gal.* 5[10]), perhaps one of the "false brethren", made trouble in Galatia, urging that Paul had been made an "apostle of the mother church" (which was apostleship "from men and through man") and was also preaching circumcision (had he not circumcised Timothy?). To undo the "bewitchment", Paul wrote *Gal.,* all of it with his own hand in "large letters", either from Ephesus or after leaving there for Macedonia.

I think this is a fair outline of an argument not easy to follow. There is a good deal more, *e.g.,* about Titus and Crete and Nicopolis, and about *Heb.* as the lost letter to Corinth. This is the third of Mr. Davies's Pauline "readjustments", and it is only by the method of trial and error that we get forward in *N.T.* as in other fields of learning. I am glad he agrees that Peter never was in Rome.

Mr. Badcock also essays a reconstruction of the apostle's life and writings, but he sticks to five visits of Paul to Jerusalem, whereas Mr. Davies makes six. And he makes *Gal.* the first of Paul's epistles, a matter which is taking a long time to settle. Next of course comes *Thess.,* but 2 precedes 1. And then come greater surprises; five epistles from Ephesus, viz., the "previous" letter to Corinth *2 Cor.* 6[14]-7[1], *Phil., Col., Philemon,* and *1 Cor.* Paul after imprisonment in Ephesus goes to Colossae, Crete (where he leaves Titus), and Corinth. Thence to Philippi where he writes the "severe" letter *2 Cor.* 10-13[10], and back to Ephesus for the riot. Once more in Philippi he writes *2 Cor.* 1-9, and, on his way to Corinth, *Rom.* Yet again in Philippi he writes *1 Tim.* to his "assistant and successor" in Ephesus. After his arrest in Jerusalem, *2 Tim.* (except 4[20]) and *Eph.* are sent from his prison in Caesarea. *Heb.,* written to Hellenist Christians in Jerusalem, is "substantially the work of Barnabas but with a Pauline postscript"; it comes from the same place and time. Paul wrote nothing from Rome, but was released and went to Spain.

The Pastorals are substantially Pauline; their peculiarities are due "to an editor working over Pauline matter", probably at Rome before *1 Clem. Acts* is dated A.D. 62; Luke and Titus are brothers.

It is obvious that a good many gages of battle are here thrown into the tournament. But they are thrown with no little ingenuity and considerable persuasiveness.

Mr. Badcock has produced a very readable book, furnished with helpful synopses and indexes and an excellent map. His modest claim is to have brought together events hitherto uncorrelated, and he argues that this bit of pragmatism is better than to despair over the jig-saw puzzle.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Birth of Christianity in the Light of To-day. By EDITH RATCLIFFE. Allenson. 5s.

The Parables of the Gospels. By HUGH MARTIN. S.C.M. 5s.

Miss Ratcliffe's posthumous work is the completion of a trilogy in which the author endeavoured to relate the writings of the *N.T.* to the circum-

stances and needs of the present generation. In the preceding volumes she dealt with the Gospels and the Pauline letters, and in this book she discusses *Acts, Hebrews,* the Catholic and Pastoral Epistles, and *Revelation.* The general appreciation with which her earlier writings were received will, we believe, be meted out to this volume, which, so far as we have tested it, reveals the same qualities of scholarship, assimilation, understanding, and communicability that characterized its predecessors. There is much here for those who come fresh to the study of the *N.T.,* and something for those already familiar with the theme. The chapters that discuss the abiding value of *Hebrews,* the *Johannine Epistles,* and the *Revelation* of John are specially helpful. It is unfortunate that the friends who prepared the book for press have gone astray in the spelling of Prof. Vernon Bartlet's name (pp. 8, 87f). There is another slight error ("contract" for "contrast" on p. 11).

The extended title of Mr. Martin's book—"and their meaning for to-day"—brings it into line with Miss Ratcliffe's volume, and witnesses to a praiseworthy recognition of the perpetual need of relating Scripture to each generation as it arises. There has been no lack of books on the parables; in addition to those recommended by Mr. Martin on p. 6 there are some that have by no means become obsolete, *e.g.,* the studies of J. C. Flower and L. E. Browne, George Murray's *Jesus and His Parables,* and especially James Drummond's *The Way of Life,* Vol. I. Trench and Bruce too, are still worth looking into. And yet Mr. Martin's book is not superfluous. It does not compete with the two most recent books on the subject, those by Dr. Oesterley and Prof. Dodd (against whose "realized eschatology" our author breaks a lance), for it is intended to serve the expositor rather farther down stream. Its chief value is its use of recent *N.T.* criticism and exegesis, but second (if second) to this is Mr. Martin's wide and sympathetic acquaintance with the new world in which we are living. His illustrations both from life and literature are fresh and stimulating. There is quite a good introductory chapter, dealing amongst other things—as is usual and right—with the question of allegory. Tested by its treatment of the crucial story of the Unjust Steward, the hard saying of *Mark* $4^{10\text{-}12}$, and the "unprofitable servants" (*Lk.* 17^{10}), the book comes well off. It should carry a minister well through a year (allowing for holidays, exchanges and the like) of week-night (or Sunday-night) addresses.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church. By P. G. S. HOPWOOD, B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D. Clark. 10s.

This is Dr. Hopwood's Ph.D. thesis at Glasgow University. It has the advantage of a commendatory Foreword by Prof. Macgregor, whose judgment is respected by all Protestant scholars. Dr. Hopwood expressly limits himself to "the period prior to the influence of Paul". He claims that Church Origins are best approached through the study of religious perience, a position which undermines a good many well-known historical investigations. But in order to discuss such experience one has to examine closely the literature of the *N.T.,* the religious and psychological background from which Christianity emerged, with all the involved problems of Messianism and Jewish Apocalyptic, and those ideas of social solidarity we see so prominent in Israel. These themes occupy 73 pages of Dr. Hopwood's book. Part II takes us to the experience of those who had contact with Jesus, or learnt of Him through the revelation of His risen life. Virtually this is a study of the Synoptics and of Paul's treatment

of the Resurrection. In dealing with the parables Dr. Hopwood takes no account of Prof. Dodd's *The Parables of the Kingdom,* probably because his thesis was *sub judice* when Dr. Dodd's work was in the press. It is all the more interesting to notice that his exposition approximates to Dr. Dodd's.

> What we have is the presentation of a crisis that is well-nigh present in the Kingdom of God, with some suggestions that the crisis will cause to emerge a community with a religious experience of a wider character than . . . conventional Judaism.

The third and largest part of the book deals with this emergence. Pentecostal and similar phenomena are expounded with illustrations drawn from a wide acquaintance with the literature of revivals and visions. The writer is clearly at home in modern psychology, knows how to use it and what pitfalls to avoid. He deals with the institution of the Church, the sacraments, the world-outlook of the early believers, their devotion to Jesus as Christ and Lord. A final chapter usefully sums up the whole matter. "Perhaps the most significant illustration of the intrinsic worth of the primitive Church religious experience lay in its intense consciousness of Christ." Paul was *not* the founder of the Church. His distinctive contribution only brought out what was already well rooted in the experience of its earlier members.

The scope and detail of Dr. Hopwood's book are such that one can hardly expect uniform satisfaction in its several positions. The treatment of the Resurrection scarcely does justice to the amount of agreement in the Gospel narratives. Similarly when the author refers to the Atonement (p. 256) he is gravely inadequate, and just because of this there is a subsequent failure to give a true ethical content to that Christ-consciousness of which he writes elaborately. Without taking Paul's experience as the inevitable type of early Christian piety, it yet may be said that the note of profound joy in his writings sounded also in the general consciousness of the Apostolic Church, as the joy that springs from the sense of a great deliverance from sin accomplished at appalling cost by a Divine Redeemer.

Despite this criticism we can heartily commend Dr. Hopwood's book as a whole. It is better than brilliant. It is sober, well-balanced, well-informed, rich in the use of illustration, easy to read and, so far as the present reviewer is concerned, well worth reading.

A. D. Martin.

The Transcendence of Jesus Christ. By F. Cawley, B.A., B.D., Ph.D. Clark. 9s.

The sub-title of this book is "A Study of the Unique Features of His Person, with special reference to the Fourth Gospel". After a brief introduction we have chapters headed, The Paradox of Jesus Christ, The Uniqueness of His Person, The Solitariness of His Cross, The Finality of Jesus Christ, and The Validity of the Fourth Gospel. The last chapter is rather an anti-climax. A few sentences added to the Introduction, indicating the author's position, would have sufficed for the support of the whole discussion. Alternatively Dr .Cawley should have given us something better than a mere summary of scholars' opinions upon questions of authorship. Nor is it quite safe to say that in matters of fact "where the Fourth Gospel differs from the Synoptists, the former is to be preferred (p. 262)". *John* may indeed be right about the date of the Last Supper, but is he right about the time of the cleansing of the Temple? Dr. Cawley touches upon various important themes such as the question of the Passibility of God and Eschatology, but he hardly explores them. The late Prof. H. R. Mackin-

tosh in a brief Foreword tells us that, "Behind his (Dr. Cawley's) pages there are years not of research merely but of contemplation". It is as a contemplative Dr. Cawley chiefly impresses us. He has written many passages of real spiritual beauty, such as remind us of Pulsford's *Quiet Hours*. Only we wish he could have been less generous in quotation. Scores of his 295 quotations from divines might have been omitted. And we wish too that the devotion had been less florid. We have "His Piercèd Hands" three times in a single chapter, as well as "Piercèd Palm, Piercèd Brow", *etc.* scattered throughout the book. The very printing of these phrases, especially that *grave* accent, indicates a type of mind more dominated by words than by ideas. Thus there are 66 pages dealing with the Cross and nowhere any clear indication of the historic causes of the Crucifixion, yet until we see those causes aright we shall not enter ethically into the significance of the Cross. Dr. Cawley emphasizes repeatedly the sinlessness and holiness of Jesus. We welcome this emphasis, but even here there is a lack of serious consideration. It is not enough to say, "The suggestion of Strauss that His (Jesus's) indignation at the Pharisees must be reckoned sin, wins no heart (p. 131)". It has won many minds, and mere denial is insufficient. One's impression is that Dr. Cawley could give his reasons. It is a pity that he does not, for his book glows with conviction concerning the unique holiness and glory of our Lord.

A. D. Martin.

The Divine Christ. By A. E. Baker. Centenary Press. 8s. 6d.

The Centenary Press was founded to commemorate one hundred years of the Oxford Movement. It has already published a notable series of books written mainly by Anglicans for the defence and exposition of Christianity as the Anglican Church interprets it.

Dr. A. E. Baker, of York, contributed recently a fresh and interesting study of the Life of Jesus, and he now follows it up with a study and defence of the doctrine of the Incarnation. He describes his book as a popular essay, and seeks in it to mediate between the general public and those who are supposed to be accredited teachers of theology and philosophy. Dr. Baker writes mainly for those who do not accept the Christian interpretation of the world and of God, and he seeks to set this view before them in a way that will meet their difficulties if only they will consider it.

The first part of his book is concerned with the arguments for theism and the difficulties which the theistic viewpoint raises—revelation, miracles, and the problem of evil. Then comes a discussion of the place of Jesus in history, and the last four or five chapters deal with the Church's interpretation of the Person and work of our Lord. Dr. Baker is very serious in his contention that the fact of the Incarnation, the fact that Christ is God, is the only solution to the mystery of the universe and contains the only hope for mankind. Christians generally would accept this position, though they might not put it quite in the same words. We question very much, however, whether Dr. Baker's very able elucidation of the subject will really appeal to the kind of outsiders he has in mind. His tone is often more dogmatic than persuasive, and while he is very deferential to modern science and criticism, his handling of it is often altogether too uncritical. He protests too much and frequently fails to discriminate as he should between what is essential and what is more or less accidental in the Christian story. He is almost ultra-modern in his insistence that the doctrine of the Incarnation emphasizes the distinction between God and man. And his theory of revelation takes but little account of the fact that it has and always must have a human side. At the same time his book has

a place for itself in the stream of modern apologetic works. It mediates very clearly and intelligently a point of view that must always be taken into account, and provides a useful introduction to a big subject.

W. B. Selbie.

God and the Modern Mind. By H. S. Box. S.P.C.K. 10s.

One of the most curious symptoms of our modern theological unrest is the rise of what is called Neoscholasticism. It is claimed for it that it is "ancient with Aristotle, medieval with St. Thomas, and modern with Cardinal Mercier". Its chosen prophet, however, is St. Thomas Aquinas, whose dogmatic rationalism is held out to us as a safe retreat from our present distress. Dr. Box has already made himself known as a stout defender of this position. His present book is a sequel to one entitled *The World of God* and is a trenchant criticism of certain modern theologies and philosophies, not because they are modern, but because they are wholly repugnant to reason. We are invited to correct them by an appeal to the serene dogmatism of the thirteenth century brought up to date.

The first three chapters of the book discuss the modern demand for a new theology. Dr. Box has no difficulty in disposing of such ideas as those of a struggling evolving deity, and of purely humanist and pantheist theologies. His method is to give ample quotations from the writers whose doctrines he attacks, but we are again and again constrained to question whether his carefully selected quotations taken out of their context do not often give an impression which some of the writers at least might be the first to repudiate.

In the latter half of the book he deals with anti-intellectualism and the philosophies of religious experience, of Value and of Being. Here, again, he seems to criticize by selection. For example, in dealing with Schleiermacher Dr. Box confines himself entirely to Schleiermacher's view of religion as a feeling of dependence and ignores the fact that this can only be understood in the light of his vast system of Christian theology, which has been as creative in the theological world as the work of Kant has been in the philosophical. The fact, however, that these two writers have been mainly responsible for the rise of the modern theology of experience is in Dr. Box's opinion their greatest condemnation. They represent, perhaps, the most extreme outcome of the departure from St. Thomas, and we must return to him before we can begin to correct the error of our ways.

This becomes very plain in the last chapter of Dr. Box's book, "Conclusions", in which he gives a careful and very interesting exposition and defence of the Thomist argument for the being of God. He identifies what he calls the modern God with an imperfect evolving being in a contingent and imperfect universe. Men cannot rest content with any such idea, and therefore, says Dr. Box,

> from changeability we argue back to a Prime Mover, from dependency to a First Cause, from contingency to a Necessary Being, from graded perfections to a Perfect Being, and from ordered multiplicity to a Supreme Intelligence.

This is certainly one way of approach to God, but it is not the only way nor is it the best. It is by no means easy to identify a metaphysical concept with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. It may be that we badly need a philosophy of theism in these days, but it is only one side of a very big subject and even in regard to that side it cannot be said that St. Thomas Aquinas has the last word.

W. B. Selbie.

The Nestorian Churches. By AUBREY R. VINE, M.A., B.D., B.Sc. Independent Press. 6s.

It is not often that we find English Free Churchmen displaying any very keen interest in the history of non-Protestant communions, least of all in the tragic fortunes of the schismatic Churches of the East. It is good to find a busy Congregational pastor concerning himself with a "History of Nestorian Christianity in Asia from the Persian schism to the modern Assyrians". Much of the story was almost completely unknown to English readers until the publication of L. E. Browne's *Eclipse of Christianity in Asia*. Mr. Vine has produced a very competent piece of work worthy to take a place among our English authorities on the subject. In tracing the origins of Nestorianism, he endeavours to be scrupulously fair both to Cyril and to Nestorius. He recognizes that while political rivalries between Alexandria and Constantinople had much to do with the issue, and that nothing can excuse the violent methods of Cyril, nevertheless the Patriarch of Alexandria was the stronger and more representative thinker of the two. On the other hand the author agrees with Loofs and Bethune-Baker that Nestorius was not a Nestorian in the crude sense of teaching "Two natures, two persons, and one presence", and that if Nestorius had had the chance to explain his views at Chalcedon, the issue might have been different.

Mr. Vine goes on to follow the later fortunes of the Nestorian Church—its amazing missionary expansion in Central and Eastern Asia, and its development under the successive governments of the Sassanids, the Caliphs, and the Mongols. He lets us see again by what a mere chance the tribes which afterwards conquered Constantinople embraced Islam instead of Christianity, with such dire results for the Eastern Churches. The story of the persecutions which have reduced this once mighty Church to a mere remnant—now in exile as one of the results of the Great War—is well told and should lead to a deeper concern on the part of English-speaking Christians for the exiled Assyrians. Such is the prayer of their Patriarch, who contributes a Foreword to the book.

E. J. PRICE.

The Beginnings of the Christian Church. By HANS LIETZMANN. Nicholson & Watson. 10s. 6d.

By including this book in their "International Library of Christian Knowledge" the publishers have rendered a great service to English readers. There is no one who possesses a wider knowledge of the field of early Church History than Dr. Lietzmann, or in so marked a degree combines scholarship with feeling for religious values. The volume before us is no mere summary of facts; it is concerned primarily with the interpretation of that manifold of thought and experience amid which the infant church achieved its characteristic form. The fifteen chapters into which the book is divided range from the Roman Conquest of Palestine to Marcion, and present a series of studies rather than a continuous narrative. New facts are brought to light, and old facts are seen in new perspective.

While all the chapters are excellent those on Philo and the Jewish Diaspora in general (with its contributions in the realms of hypostasis-doctrine and worship), on the Roman Empire and its Religious Life, and on Gnosticism, are especially illuminating. Paul and Ignatius receive their proper due. In passing we should note that the breach between Paul and Peter is emphasized, while the author takes the view that Paul was not a consenting party to the Apostolic Decree.

No student of the early Church can afford to neglect this book, which leaves us eagerly awaiting the promised further volumes on the history of

the Early Church. It is to be hoped that the publishers will be encouraged to make these further volumes accessible to English readers.

The translation into English is done by Dr. Lee Woolf, who is one of the editors of the series. It has been done with extraordinary skill. Except for an awkward phrase here and there, it does not read like a translation. Unhappily, however, the proof-reading has not been done as well as might have been expected. There are misprints or mis-spellings on pp. 124, 139, 143, 144, 148, 213, and 396; an error in punctuation on page 154; we get "Pompei" for "Pompey" on p. 205; "Ositia" for "Ostia" on p. 255; "were" for "was" on p. 260, "distant" for "distinct" (?) on page 332; "every citations" on p. 384. On p. 142 there is an intrusive "not" which destroys the meaning, while on p. 143 "could not regard" is evidently meant for "could not *but* regard". These are sad blemishes in a good book.

E. J. Price.

Mediaeval Religion (The Forwood Lectures 1934) and other Essays. By Christopher Dawson. Sheed & Ward. 6s.

Mr. Christopher Dawson has this great merit: he is rarely dull. Here is an extremely interesting book. It contains four lectures on medieval religion: The Sociological Foundations, The Theological Development, Religion and Mediaeval Science, Religion and Mediaeval Literature. These are followed by essays on The Origins of the Romantic Tradition and The Vision of Piers Plowman. Mr. Dawson belongs to the best class of popularizers of knowledge. There is little that is new in the book, but familiar problems are posed in an agreeably fresh fashion, and familiar answers are given with an original accent. The first lecture is an example of Mr. Dawson's skill in setting out a problem in a stimulating way. If the actual examination is more conventional than at first seemed likely, that is no fault of his. In the lecture on religion and medieval science Mr. Dawson is less happy. The treatment is rather superficial. The essay on the Romantic Tradition serves as an expansion and continuation of the fourth lecture on Religion and Mediaeval Literature. Here Mr. Dawson emphasizes the importance of Provençal society and literature in providing an exotic strain in medieval culture. This strain he traces to contacts with Spanish Mohammedanism. His thesis, stated with characteristic clarity, is probably overstated; but it is an error on the right side. We too often forget the dominance of medieval Mohammedanism and its effects, good and evil, on European life. We have to thank Islam, for instance, for Spanish clericalism and Spanish anti-clericalism: clericalism provoked in reaction to Islam, and anti-clericalism in reaction to clericalism.

The danger of all Mr. Dawson's work is that he can say very trite or very questionable things in so impressive a manner that we think we are getting farther than in fact we are. He is a little too fond also of pouring out portentous lists of names whose significance he does not attempt to elucidate satisfactorily. On examination they are sometimes found to add little but external adornment to his work.

Mr. Dawson's book is of course tendentious. His scholarship and his willingness to see at least some virtue in Protestantism make him a far more effective propagandist than most of his crude co-religionists who write on the Middle Ages. For them he has biting rebukes. He sneers prettily at "Catholics who know their Middle Ages only in a modern bowdlerized form", at "the idealized Catholic England of the apologist", and at "the Merry England of mediaevalist myth". He allows that some of the religious heritage of medieval religion is to be found even better outside the modern Roman Church than in it.

> The spiritual successors of Langland are to be found not in the Catholic (*sic*) Church, nor even (*sic*) in the Church of England, but among the Puritans and the rebels, with Fox and Bunyan and Whitefield and Blake.

"Moravian and Methodist hymn writers", with their Christocentric piety, are in the authentic line of successors of St. Bernard, of *Jesus dulcis memoria,* and *Salve caput cruentatum*. We are getting on. We are getting on indeed.

The most attractive essay, and the most easy, is the last, The Vision of Piers Plowman. Here is true appreciation of that superb poem. We end with one acidly accurate sentence.

> With all its talk of class-consciousness modern Socialism has failed to produce any work of "proletarian" literature that is comparable to this (*Piers Plowman*) in depth and poignancy.

We agree. The ignorant and opinionated *intelligentsia* who fancy that wisdom and understanding began with Marx and culminated in themselves might be purged, to everyone's advantage, if they would demean themselves so low as to consider in the company of their Christian countryman Langland "the bitter cry of the socially disinherited against the injustice of their lot".

B. L. MANNING.

Bede, His Life, Times, and Writings. Essays in commemoration of the twelfth centenary of his death. Edited by A. HAMILTON THOMPSON. Oxford Press. 15s.

The name of the editor is in itself a sufficient guarantee of the sound learning behind this book. Various as the essays in it are, they form a unity; and if few pages are easy reading there is hardly a page which does not repay the energy that it demands. Many of the essays will suffer unnecessarily in the eyes of readers who are not specialists because the book does not contain a sketch of the relevant secular history of northern England. Dr. Watson's essay on "The Age of Bede"—an essay so characteristic that we could almost hear him reading every sentence of it—does something to give Bede's career a setting in the larger life of Christendom, but Dr. Watson is not concerned to provide the more detailed chart for English history. Nowhere will the ordinary reader feel his ignorance of secular history more painfully than in the essay on the life of Bede. Dr. Whiting has written a learned and even lively account which brings across the centuries the beauty of Bede's holiness; but at times it is a little confusing, for so many of the other people in the story are mere names. The Editor's own essay on Northumbrian Monasticism would also gain if the reader had a clearer political background for it. This essay—the high point of the volume, be it said—is of permanent and general value. No one interested in English history can afford to miss it. Dr. Hamilton Thompson shows in a quite fresh way the relation of Gallo-Roman, Irish, and "Celtic" Christianity with the new Roman mission under Augustine; and a number of disconnected facts suddenly appear as an intelligible design. What seems like a rather squalid struggle of the Celtic and Roman Churches is seen to be something more than that.

We reach rather less difficult country in Dr. Levison's "Bede as Historian", in Dr. Claude Jenkins's "Bede as Exegete and Theologian", and in Mr. Colgrave's "Bede's Miracle Stories". Of these, Dr. Levison's is much the most satisfying. Dr. Jenkins's essay makes us aware of great learning, but also makes us aware that it is not being fully or systematically used. At times, if we may say so with respect, the essay sinks from

charm to preciosity, to repetition, even to something near silliness. Mr. Colgrave's is nice work; but, perhaps from the nature of the subject, leaves us very much where we were. One of the best essays in the volume is Mr. Laistner's on "The Library of the Venerable Bede". Here is exact scholarship, well organized and attractively presented. Two short papers complete the work: one by Sir Charles Peers on the buildings at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, and one by the late Provost of Eton on the Manuscripts of Bede. The names of the authors are a sufficient description of these papers. We regret that no attempt was made to give Bede his ecclesiastical setting. He has recently been canonized. It would be attractive to measure the distance which the body that canonized him has moved from his theology, from his churchmanship, and from his daily life of devotional thought and practice.

B. L. Manning.

Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. By Watkin Williams. Manchester University Press. (Historical Series No. LXIX.) 25s.

This book has delighted and has disappointed us. Mr. Watkin Williams has written, as his earlier work led us to expect, with enthusiasm and with knowledge; but his new study of St. Bernard, valuable and interesting as it is, is not the biography for which we hoped.

No reader will close the book without feeling that he knows St. Bernard better. Mr. Williams himself is so familiar with St. Bernard's writings that on every occasion he brings forward the apt quotation. This skilful use of St. Bernard's own words is perhaps the strongest feature of the book, for was there ever a talker or a writer more delightful, more sprightly, more penetrating, more stinging than St. Bernard? We cannot deny ourselves a few examples. When Henry II wavered between the two competitors for the Papacy, Innocent II and Anacletus, St. Bernard asked him:

> Of what are you afraid? Are you afraid of sinning by obeying Innocent? Just consider for how many other sins you have to answer to God. Leave this one to me. I will answer for it.

His description of the Romans, as it is never out of date, can never be too well-known. He is commiserating with the Pope:

> What am I to say of the populace? It is the Roman people! I could neither more briefly nor yet more exactly give you my opinion of your parishioners. What for centuries has been so notorious as the shamelessness and arrogance of the Romans? A race quarrelsome and turbulent; a race up to this very day untamed and intractable, that knows not to submit save only when it is not strong enough to resist.

In another mood he writes to his old friend, the dying Suger, the statesman-monk who had ruled France so well and so long:

> I have loved you from the beginning and I shall love you without end. This I can confidently say: It is impossible that I should ever really lose so beloved a friend. A man whose soul is bound to mine by an indissoluble union, by an unbreakable link, I am not losing; he is going before me. Only, when you reach that place to which you go, remember me, that to me also it may soon be given to follow you and to be with you.

The book is a mine of information about St. Bernard's multifarious activities. There is, for instance, an account of every one of the sixty-eight daughter-houses of Clairvaux founded during his life. Yet with all its learning and enthusiasm the book fails partly as a biography. The

author has abandoned a chronological treatment and dealt with the several aspects of St. Bernard's career in separate chapters. There is no confusion; cross-references make it easy to relate the chapters; but we do not see the growth and development of St. Bernard's character and work. Nor do we find any attempt to estimate the place of his career and his ideals in European history. The treatment of his thought and his controversy with Abelard is meagre and unsatisfactory.

The truth is that from the first page to the last Mr. Williams is hampered by a desire to edify us. The "message for us to-day" is never far from his thought. St. Bernard appears as the model saint. The author's reluctance to admit that his hero was ever unreasonable or was ever finally defeated makes him slur over some parts of the story and give us less precise information than we want. Mr. Williams is always on the defensive, answering every possible criticism before it can be made. Now St. Bernard is too great and too pure to need this fussy care: indeed his splendid humanity and his attractive petulance time and again break through and defy all Mr. Williams's precautions. Hitherto St. Bernard has suffered less than the unfortunate St. Francis from his friends. We hope that Mr. Williams is not setting a new bad fashion.

Mr. Williams is happier when he is discussing St. Bernard's literary style (as he does in a delightful appendix) than when he is handling theological problems. He allows his readers to miss the significance of St. Bernard's plain speaking to the Pope, and the part that it played in later opposition to the papal monarchy. We cannot help fearing that Mr. Williams has a tendency to smooth out the creases from the life of medieval Catholicism. Did this prevent his facing more boldly the awkward problems raised for some modern schools of churchmanship by St. Bernard's denunciation of the institution of the feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, "a new solemnity unknown to the ritual of the Church, unfounded in reason, unsanctioned by ancient tradition"? There is a certain *naïveté* in Mr. Williams's treatment of Gregory VII and in his reference to Arianism as if it were non-credal and non-institutional Christianity.

Mr. Williams's own style is marred by some nasty tricks. He ornaments his pages with French, Latin, and even Greek words and tags when plain English would do better. An insecure hold of English idiom seems to be betrayed by the tiresome use of "would have" for "must have" or even for "had".

Is it useless to appeal to the Manchester University Press to alter the peculiarly depressing format of the valuable books which it produces in its historical series? There are indeed few downright mistakes (though quite enough to make Mr. Williams's gibe at Milman's misprint unintentionally funny). But the type is unattractive; the execution of the plans and maps is unworthy; and the blotchy illustrations must do vast injustice to Mrs. Williams's original "beautiful sketches".

B. L. Manning.

Poems. By Frederick George Scott, D.S.O., M.C. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.
Praise. By Gladys M. Rees. S.P.C.K. 2s.
Chota Chants: Modern Scots Verse. By William Hutcheson. Glasgow: Fraser, Edward. 5s.

The illustrations to the poems by Gladys M. Rees are perfectly charming; the poetry, though it shows a fine sense of the things that are beautiful, is not on the same level. There is a pleasant picture of Kent, with its

> rounded toppling hop-kilns
> And old deserted mills.

The verses in modern Scots are curiously uneven; a much smaller book would have revealed the writer's gifts more worthily. Much of the book consists of sentiments versified. The war poems cast a light upon war psychology, but they do not greatly enrich the store of poetry.

The poems by Frederick George Scott will be read with admiration by Canadians, among whom he has a place of honour; they will be welcomed by others who value such a register of lofty thought expressed with a mastery of rhythm. The poems are the harvest of a profoundly Christian mind. They are most successful when they are least concerned with the events of his time, upon which the poet reflects. His poem on Kipling, for example, is more enthusiastic than discriminating; and in the verses prompted by the War there is little that is distinctive; the poet takes throughout the part of a fierce patriot, to whom, for example, a pro-Boer was a "babbling Pharisee". It is in the poems which deal with the enduring realities of Christian faith that he will find the reader most: "Look through these windows on Eternity". But the book is too long; once more, a poet who wishes to live has to travel light; and so much of this book falls short of the poet's own standard.

E. Shillito.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

The new volume of the "Speaker's Bible" (Aberdeen: Speaker's Bible Office, 9s. 6d.) is *Romans,* Volume I, which takes the Epistle as far as the end of the eleventh chapter. The introductory article is by Dr. Vincent Taylor, and extended treatment is given to various topics by the Rev. J. H. Morrison. The Index to Sermons is very full, and will be found useful by preachers who like to see what their predecessors have said about a text.

It is rather noticeable that, so far as we can see, Sir F. G. Kenyon's *The Text of the Greek Bible* (Duckworth, 5s.) makes no reference to Dr. Souter's *Text and Canon of the New Testament* in the same series, possibly because it is meant to supersede it. We say "as far as we can see", because we noticed on p. 138 a reference to Dr. Souter which is not in the Index. To many ministers textual criticism calls to mind the dullest moments of their training, but to all who have had to handle documents it is one of the most absorbing of subjects. The most valuable of Sir Frederic's chapters are those on "Textual Discoveries and Theories, 1881-1936" and "The Present Textual Problem", in which the writer's wide knowledge and unique opportunities are employed to advantage.

New Testament scholars must not overlook Dr. W. Emery Barnes's *Gospel Criticism and Form Criticism* (Clark, 2s. 6d.), a little book in which he defends "oral tradition", the authenticity of the Gospels, and the Matthean authorship of the First Gospel. Dr. Martin Dibelius, Dr. Barnes's *bête noire,* is denounced for his "hardihood" and his classification of the Gospel stories is criticized as being purely subjective. The form critics have failed altogether, Dr. Barnes holds, to give due weight to the evidence of the 2nd century Fathers, and the Gospels have not had a "fair deal" in that it has often been forgotten that they are ancient books composed and written out under ancient conditions.

The Dean of Exeter has written on many subjects, but he breaks new ground in *The Bible View of Life* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 7s. 6d.), a book which is not easy to classify. Some of the chapters formed the Scott

Holland Memorial Lectures, and an appreciative study of Holland is prefixed. Dr. Carpenter shows the sense in which the Bible is a unity, and then he gathers together its teaching about God, man, providence, the city of God, social questions, *etc.* We found the later chapters more appealing, especially that on "The Magic of Bible Words". Dr. Carpenter will not mind our saying that the collection of Bible passages he has made—how marvellous, how beautiful, they are—makes his own style much less satisfying than otherwise we might have found it.

Scotland has so far shown no great love for pacifists, and it is as encouraging as it is surprising to find Prof. G. H. C. Macgregor of Glasgow coming down emphatically on the pacifist side. Dr. Macgregor's **The New Testament Basis of Pacifism* (James Clarke, 3s. 6d.) systematically examines the New Testament texts generally urged against pacifism, and then goes on to discuss the teaching of Jesus. He asks:

> What is the specifically Christian way of meeting and overcoming evil, as set forth in the teaching, example and Cross of Christ? Can War under any circumstances be held to be consistent with that way?

Making full use of writers like G. J. Heering, C. J. Cadoux, H. H. Farmer, C. H. Dodd, and C. E. Raven, Dr. Macgregor makes a strong case.

The reader may next turn to Mr. W. M. Watt's *Can Christians Be Pacifists?* (S.C.M., 2s.), where he will find it urged that even if we accept the teaching of Jesus about loving enemies and turning the other cheek, it does not follow that we must renounce war unconditionally.

> Such is the complexity of international relations that, however painful he may find it, the Christian may sometimes find himself obliged to resort to war as part of his Christian duty. . . Moral situations may sometimes be so complex that love for B may compel us to do violence to C. . . For it is not inconceivable that a situation may arise where, presupposing that A has genuine Christian love for both B and C, it will nevertheless be A's Christian duty to kill C out of love for B.

We do not find Mr. Watt convincing, but his arguments and his constructive suggestions deserve the attention of pacifists.

We wish it had been possible to give unqualified commendation to the first book published by the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead since he became minister of the City Temple. But *It Happened in Palestine* (Hodder, 7s. 6d.) is so obviously a quickly written book—it looks as if the chapters were spoken addresses—based on a recent visit to Palestine, that its author can scarcely expect it to make any lasting impression. Words come easily to Mr. Weatherhead, but many devoted readers will be put off to find Jesus as "Big Brother" and "the first Gentleman of the World" on consecutive pages, and as "inexorable Lover" and "The Hound of Heaven" on one page a little further on. Recently we have had books on Palestine in which other recent visitors such as Mr. St. John Ervine, Mr. H. V. Morton, and Mr. Beverley Nichols have written from their particular angles, and Mr. Weatherhead writes as a psycho-therapist, who aims at throwing light on some of the things that happened in Palestine from his own consulting room. Here we are not impressed in the least. Where Mr. Weatherhead is at his best is in his exposition of the home at Bethany and "one thing is needful". We still await a book in which Mr. Weatherhead writes objectively: he always gets in front of his subject, whatever it is—we cannot forget him in the Garden of Gethsemane or on the road to Jericho, and when he gives his version of a verse he has to say "I translate independently". And it looks as if T. R. Glover and W. R. Maltby have been telescoped into one person on p. 74.

It was perhaps unfortunate for Mr. Weatherhead that his book appeared at a time when it inevitably invited comparison with Mr. Morton's: certainly it is unfortunate that we read it at the same time as Canon Peter Green's *Some Gospel Scenes and Characters* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), which is much less pretentious in form. Canon Green also reconstructs Gospel incidents, sometimes as drastically as Mr. Weatherhead, if at others he seems unduly credulous; but there is a fervour about his faith which is always irresistible. His chapters on Mary, the mother of Jesus, the Visit of the Magi, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and the Resurrection are always illuminating and often startling. A book from which preachers will get many ideas.

There is a refreshing simplicity about **Prayer* (Hodder & Stoughton, 2s. 6d.), the work of Prof. O. Hallesby, of the Independent Theological Seminary, Oslo. The exegesis is not always convincing—notably in the account of the miracle at Cana; the translation is sometimes quaint, as when the Church is exhorted to "stand together on its knees"; but there is an earnestness and sincerity about it all which is very appealing. The book has often reminded us of R. F. Horton's *Open Secret,* which will in itself be sufficient to commend it to many readers of these pages. We are grateful to Norway for sending us a book of this type.

The Rev. F. H. Brabant, the Bampton Lecturer for 1936, while pointing out that the Lectures, *Time and Eternity in Christian Thought* (Longmans, 15s.) were written in Zululand and not in Oxford, admits that some hearers found them difficult. So they are, and non-philosophers, at any rate, will feel a sense of relief that Mr. Brabant was far from "recent books and recent theories" when he wrote. The first lectures are historical —setting forth the conception of eternity in Greek (Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus), in Christian (the Bible, Augustine, Boethius, Aquinas, Hooker), and in modern (pre-Kantian, the German school, Bergson, Alexander, Whitehead) thought. Then come the "speculative" lectures—"On the Nature of Time", showing Time cannot subsist without the support of a non-temporal principle; "On the Nature of Eternity", the Christian conception being "the Greek idea of faultless perfection moralized and deepened by the Christian sense of personality"; leading on to the consideration of Creation, Predestination, and Eternal Life. Of special importance are the two Appendixes, learned studies of the words for "Eternal" in the Bible, and of the Incarnation—"the relation of the eternal and temporal in the course of this world order". This erudite survey demands and deserves the attention of all theologians. The frequent use of Browning is a significant feature.

If Karl Barth has shown himself very critical of the Group Movement Emil Brunner has written its best defence. **The Church and the Oxford Group* (Hodder, 1s. 6d.) does not meet some of the criticisms which have been passed on the Movement (notably in regard to guidance), but it gives an uncompromising testimony to its ideals, its methods, and its achievements, which in many places will be found convincing.

Dr. W. Fairweather's *Among the Mystics* (Clark, 5s.) is intended to do for the 20th century what R. A. Vaughan's *Hours with the Mystics* did for the 19th. Deliberately aiming at being more popular than Dean Inge's Bampton Lectures, it is nevertheless an adequate, if succinct, account of the life and teaching of the great mystics, and particularly the Chrsitian mystics. Not sparing of quotation, Dr. Fairweather's summary provides a just estimate of the contribution made to the devotional life and to Christian learning by men and women of different centuries, but one in their realization of the presence and power of God.

In *They Found God* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) Miss M. L. Christlieb has forsaken the India she knows so well, and turned to Tersteegen's *Leben heiliger Seelen* (1753, now unobtainable), whence she has derived the material for the lives of eight mystics—the only word perhaps that describes them all: Armelle, the Marquis of Renty, Marina of Escobar, Nicholas von der Flue, Maria Guyard, Catherine of Genoa, Heinrich Suso, and Anna Garcias, the friend of St. Teresa—we learn how they strove to do the will of God, and learnt obedience through suffering.

It is perhaps the West Riding directness of Mrs. A. M. Wilkinson's **Facing Life* (Livingstone Press, 1s.) which makes a special appeal to us. The sub-title is "A Book about Everyone's Vocation", and all that the writer has to say is "on the spot" and in the closest touch with the life of to-day. If ministers would use the book as the basis for discussions with groups of young people, they would find it exceptionally valuable.

It looks as if we are to have every year a book by Mr. Rom Landau with a striking cover without and an amazing amalgam within. How many readers, we wonder, could predict the contents of *Thy Kingdom Come* (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.) with its "Twelve Chapters on the Attainment of Truthful Living": the chapters are "God and Man", "The Mechanics of Fate", "Responsibility", "Thought", "Prayer", "Love", "Service", "Humility and Gratitude", "Money and the Mechanics of Success", "Sex", "Effort and Power", and "Christ in our Time". Mr. Landau believes in the teaching of Jesus, in Karma, and in an occultism which will afford a tolerance far greater than any the Churches can reach; the last words in his book are:

> But the combined efforts of our hearts and minds enriched by deeper studies, can make Christ emerge from the heavy dreams of our awakened I. His life can then become for us a tremendous cosmorama, viewed from the mountain top under a morning sky innocent of clouds.

Ministers looking for help for Lenten addresses could do much worse than turn to Canon W. E. Lutyens's *God's Way With a Soul* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 3s. 6d.), which he calls "A Lent Pilgrimage", a volume of quiet meditations, devotional in spirit, which never become trite or tame.

The Bishop of London has written his own Lenten book this year, and as there are some who are helped by the Rev. W. H. Elliott, they may be helped by the Bishop's *Everyman's Problems and Difficulties* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.), which is of much the same *genre* as Mr. Elliott's talks. True, they will learn much that is strange as they go along—as that (italics ours)

> it is a remarkable fact that *when the Puritans fled to Pennsylvania* to escape the persecution of the Church at home, they showed themselves quite as intolerant as the Church which they had left behind.

They will also learn of "the hero of Tennyson's poem" who said "For I intend to get to God"—and five lines of Browning's "Johannes Agricola" are then quoted with nine mistakes! The Archbishop of Canterbury writes a commendatory Foreword: we should have expected *him* to know the difference between Tennyson and Browning.

Toyohiko Kagawa's *The Thorn in the Flesh* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) outlines, in five addresses, "God's Message to Those in Trouble". With the power that springs from simplicity Kagawa offers words of comfort and help.

**Christian Freedom in the Modern World* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) is a thoughtful and timely little book by the Rev. J. E. L. Newbigin, who sets out to examine and in the event to criticize Prof. John Macmurray's *Freedom in the Modern World*. He accepts the philosopher's contention that the good

life must have the whole emotional force of an integrated personality behind it, but he believes Prof. Macmurray errs in eliminating the idea of obedience to duty from the moral life. The analysis of Macmurray's position is very well done, showing as it does how religion is the awareness of an absolute moral obligation, and leading up to the view that there is no solution of the paradox of law and freedom apart from the Christian gospel of forgiveness.

In *Christianity and Communism* (Blackwell, 2s. 6d.) the Editor of *The Spectator* edits and introduces the articles which Dr. Ernest Barker, Dean Inge, Mr. John Strachey, Father D'Arcy, Dr. Joseph Needham, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, and Canon F. R. Barry recently contributed to his pages, with some of the resulting correspondence. There is some hard whacking, but the papers were well worth reprinting.

In the Preface to *The Interpretation of History* (Scribners, 8s. 6d.) Dr. Paul Tillich, like many other fine scholars an exile from Germany, who belongs to Lutheranism "by birth, education, religious experience, and theological reflection", expresses his indebtedness to Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr of New York. This work is strangely reminiscent of Dr. Niebuhr's, especially in its style, but it is even harder to follow. We found it all very heavy going, and confess that the sections "The Demonic" and "Kairos and Logos" left us altogether baffled, so much so that we began to wonder if senile decay had already set in. Part I, "On the Boundary", is an autobiographical sketch written from an unusual angle, the writer showing how his life has been spent on the boundary between country and country, between reality and imagination, theology and philosophy, Lutheranism and Socialism, and so on. The remaining sections are "Political Categories of the Interpretation of History", and "Theological Categories of the Interpretation of History", the latter including "Church and Culture", "The Interpretation of History and the Idea of Christ", and "Eschatology and History". We doubt whether the translators have helped the author as much as they might : sometimes where "profane" is used "secular" would express the meaning much better, and "I nurtured" may be American, but it is not English.

Students of medicine and students of humanity—especially of human credulity—will be grateful to Dr. J. R. Whitwell for gathering together *Historical Notes on Psychiatry* (H. K. Lewis, 10s. 6d.). This covers from "Early Times" to the end of the 16th century, and makes fascinating reading. The Scriptures, the Classics, the philosophers, and classical medical writers are the sources, and then a special chapter is devoted to "Some Special Forms of Mental and Nervous Disorder". The last hundred pages contain 65 translations and extracts in chronological order, from Hippocrates to the end of Elizabeth's reign, when we still have remedies like this for the "falling sickness" :

> Take a frogge out of a poole when he cryeth, and cut out his galle, and mix the same with wyne, or beere, and administer it to the patient.

Not only doctors and medical students, but all those who touch psychotherapy at any point will find Dr. Clifford Allen's *Modern Discoveries in Medical Psychology* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) extremely useful. It contains nothing that is new, but it is a very handy summary of developments that have taken place in recent years. The first chapter, which is preliminary, deals with Mesmer and is perhaps the worst in the book, the attempt to find modern parallels being overdone. The other chapters outline the work of Janet, Morton Prince, Freud, Adler, Jung, Kretschmer, and Pavlov. Dr. Allen is an out and out Freudian, but his bias is so evident that the

reader is never misled. He has, too, a violent objection to "mysticism", though he never defines quite what mysticism means. An indication perhaps is found in his attitude toward religion. In the chapter on Jung he has some sound observations on attempts to mix religion with analysis, but that scarcely justifies the unqualified statement that "a priest is more dangerous than helpful to the mentally ill".

Miss A. Graham Ikin, a psychologist working under the Archbishop of York's Committee of doctors and clergy, has followed her *Religion and Psychotherapy* by *The Background of Spiritual Healing* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.), which consists in the main of lectures at a conference on the relation between Psychotherapy and the Church's Ministry of Healing. The lectures, though containing little that is new to those familiar with the subject, could be read with advantage by ministers and others disturbed by the Church's neglect of this branch of her ministry. The lecture on "Psychoanalysis and Confession" is perhaps the best in the book.

The Old Law and the New Morality (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.), the work of the Rev. J. P. Gannon, an Irish Jesuit, is of value in that it exhibits both the strength and the weakness of the Roman Catholic position. It is an exposition of the Ten Commandments from which Protestants can learn a good deal, though they will note the bitterness in regard to Russia, the unyielding attitude in regard to sexual morality, and the unhappy quibbling about falsehood.

We cannot find Dr. W. E. Orchard's *The Cult of Our Lady* (Williams & Norgate, 2s. 6d.), "A Defence, An Explanation, and An Appeal", anything but pathetic. All the old fire seems to have departed, and Dr. Orchard allows himself to use arguments which at one time he would have riddled and ridiculed. This little book lacks altogether the convincing power of Dr. Orchard's earlier writings. Here is the Orchard of to-day:

> And if any should suggest that our Lady had the unique and therefore unfair advantage of being miraculously conceived free from the stain of original sin, it must be pointed out that there was only granted to her then what is given to us all in our baptism, and on the same ground, that of Christ's merits.

Bearing the title of a historic Congregational letter, written by his namesake, the Rev. Robert Brown's *A New Year's Gift* (Indep. Press, 1s.) is a fresh and suggestive study of the contribution which Congregationalism can make to the world of to-day.

Speaking the Truth—in Love (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) contains the new "Warrack Lectures", and gives the Rev. G. F. Macleod's conception of the modern preacher's task. In Govan Mr. Macleod has done a remarkable work which gives him the right to be heard, and the best part of his book is the account of the way the fellowship of which he is minister set to work to carry the Word to the people of the parish. What that Word is, how it should be supreme, how it should be preached and lived out in love —that is the burden of Mr. Macleod's counsel to preachers. At times sophisticated readers will feel his illustrations hackneyed, but they will forget this as they proceed to his irresistible plea for a ministry, by the preacher and the fellowship together, of love in the name of Christ.

To judge from Dr. W. F. Howard's "Foreword", the five lectures on preaching in the Rev. F. E. Harte's *I Make a Sermon* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) must have been more effective when spoken than they are to read. We have no idea of the calibre of ministers of Ulster Methodism who attended the "Refresher School" and heard the lectures: they would be

reminded rather of the "school" than of the "refresher", for Mr. Harte speaks as if to elementary students most of the time. However, there is no book on preaching from which one fails to learn, and this is no exception, but we hope that the refreshed have not made their reading "omniverous" (p. 41)!

Help—great help—is given to the new missionary by one with experience of work in India, the Rev. W. J. Culshaw, whose **A Missionary Looks at His Job* (S.C.M., 2s.) is packed with sound counsel based on his own experience. This little book should be given to all going to the foreign field, and it would be a good thing if its contents could be made known not merely to Missionary Boards, but to all Christians. A wiser little book on the work of Christian Missions we have not met.

Miss R. F. Woodsmall's *Moslem Women Enter a New World* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is a big book, packed with facts and figures, but it is also packed with interest, and its illustrations really illustrate. Miss Woodsmall has been at work in the Near East for the Y.W.C.A., was Research Fellow since the War, and now, in a publication of that fine institution, the American University of Beirut, she gives us the results of her observations. Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Trans-jordan, Turkey, Iraq, Iran, India—in all these Moslems are numerous: how is the life of Moslem women reacting to the changes of this rapidly changing world? This is the question Miss Woodsmall answers, and we feel the note of authority in all she says. Veiling and purdah, child marriage, polygamy, divorce, education, economic opportunity and independence, health, maternity, politics—about all these we are informed in turn. In twenty years Moslem women in some lands have come out into the world. Will it be for good or ill? At first sight we assume the former, and no doubt in the long run it will be for good; we must be prepared, however, for retrogression for a time; tradition, and custom, and religion are breaking down, and as yet their substitutes are by no means available for these women.

The Rev. William Paton (it is more than time one of the Scottish Universities gave him a D.D.) has done nothing better than **Christianity in the Eastern Conflicts* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.) which we cordially commend to all our readers. Mr. Paton took with him on his journey to the Near and Far East last winter wide knowledge, keen sympathy, and a long and intimate experience of Christian Missions. His trained and observant eye has provided the material for a skilful pen, and the Churches will do well to ponder what he has to say. The situation Miss Woodsmall describes regarding women on a restricted field, Mr. Paton surveys over a far wider area. It would be foolish to summarize his facts and contentions when his book is cheap enough to be obtained and read by all: he makes his case that this is a day of opportunity for the Christian Church in every land; his sense of urgency is such that we hope it will shake Christians out of their complacency.

The Rev. E. A. Payne, to whom we offer our best wishes in his work as Editorial Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society, has done good service in *The First Generation* (Carey Press, 2s.), a sketch of the Society's early missionaries. Too often Carey, Marshman, and Ward alone are remembered, and others forgotten, even by Baptists themselves: Mr. Payne reminds us of less well-known men—and women—whose witness was equally heroic.

Dr. J. H. Moulton called Samuel Rahator "a modern St. Francis". Rahator died last Easter, after serving for 50 years as a missionary to the Marathas in Bombay and on "the jungle trail", along which he travelled

12,000 miles a year. The story of his life, told by the Rev. Frank Hart in *Rahator of Bombay* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.) is a stirring witness to what can be done by a man full of faith and willingness to sacrifice. Methodist Missions have had no finer exponent than this Indian Christian.

For 25 years the Rev. James Haldane has been a missionary in Southern Morocco. His *Missionary Romance in Morocco* (Pickering, 2s. 6d.) gives us much information about the people among whom he has laboured. The chapter on Moorish proverbs is especially illuminating.

The Archbishop of Brisbane's *History of the Early Church to A.D. 500* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.), though it deals with the earliest period, is the last of a trilogy which covers the whole history of the Church, the other volumes being Miss Deanesly's *History of the Medieval Church* and his own *History of the Modern Church*. Dr. Wand has provided a summary which students will find useful, especially those reading for examinations, although the volume, covering 500 crowded years in 260 pages, is necessarily "potted history". The "Tables" at the end are exceptionally serviceable.

Mr. C. E. M. Joad does not lack courage, and he has even set out to tell *The Story of Indian Civilization* (Macmillan, 2s. 6d.) in 150 pages. In about 5,000 words he summarizes 3,000 years of history, and then he proceeds to discuss the mingling of races, philosophy and religion, the caste system, art and literature, politics and government, and the impact of the West. It is a *tour de force*, and will make an admirable "cram" book. But the reader will not need to be reminded that Mr. Joad has an anti-Christian bias; there is no reference to William Carey or to Christian Missions, though we learn that

> in the 18th century the arrival of the Christian powers in India presented Hinduism with new problems

and the Brahmo-Samaj movement arose as a result.

Archdeacon C. P. S. Clarke's *The Via Media* (Longmans, 5s.) is the work of one convinced that the *Via Media* represented by Anglicanism is the basis for the Church of the future. Mr. Clarke writes clearly, if naïvely, and the opening chapters, examining Roman claims, are well done. But our confidence begins to waver when we read (twice) of "Chrysostem", find "J. A." Froude for "R. H.", familiar words of Browning misquoted, and learn that

> the Church of England rediscovered and, in course of time, propagated, certain principles vital in the life of the Church, that were in danger of being forgotten. We do both ourselves, and other religious communions, and the sacred cause of charity itself, a real disservice if we belittle our own achievement.

One who is inaccurate in spelling, initials, quotations, and dates may of course be reliable in other ways, but Mr. Clarke should know that Nonconformists were ejected from the Church by the Act of Uniformity and did not "abandon the Church because of Savoy after the Conference of 1662". To him the Anglican Church is the Bridge Church, and the Bridge

> would certainly break if in any scheme of reunion we ceased to stipulate that the Historic Episcopate and an episcopally ordained ministry should be retained.

Those who believe that the 13th is the most fascinating century in Europe's history will hail with gladness the new volume of Methuen's "History of Medieval and Modern Europe", Dr. C. W. Previté-Orton's *History of Europe from 1198 to 1378* (16s.). But what a task the writer's was! The first chapter, a survey of "Europe and Its Peoples in 1200" in

36 pages, must be got through; it contains meat enough for a volume. And then what plums are provided in these crowded years—Innocent III, Louis IX, Francis of Assisi, Dante, Aquinas, Wyclif, the Crusades, the "Babylonish Captivity", the Black Death—and many more. Dr. Previté-Orton has provided a competent and well-balanced sketch of the period, with suggestions for reading which are very useful: maps and genealogical tables help to make the volume a boón to the student.

The Netherlands Divided, 1609-1648 (Williams & Norgate. 12s. 6d.) is a continuation of Prof. P. Geyl's very useful *The Revolt of the Netherlands*, both being translations of his *History of the Netherlandish Race*. Prof. Geyl argues that the division of the Netherlands was brought about by the interference of Spain, and the divergence in religion was the result, and not the cause, of the split. The growth of a different mentality and outlook in the two parts—with Protestantism and "a particularist North-Netherlandish pariotism" in the North, and "the re-establishment of the Catholic Church in all her Counter-Reformation militancy in Brabant and Flanders"—is the subject of this new volume. The maps add to the value of a work for which students will be grateful. It comes with rather a shock to find in a work of this kind that Antwerp and the Southern Netherlands "fell for him [Rubens] enthusiastically".

We have found great delight in Miss Gladys Scott Thomson's *Life in a Noble Household* (Cape, 12s. 6d.) both because of its contents and because of the extremely competent way in which the author has performed a difficult task. From the account books and other papers of William Russell, fifth Earl and first Duke of Bedford, Miss Scott Thomson has given us an intimate and convincing picture of a noble household at Woburn Abbey and Bedford House in the Strand in the 17th century. The houses and gardens, the making and spending of money, health and education, servants and travel, food and drink, pictures and books—one turns with fascinated mind from one chapter to another. Writers of social, political, and religious history will here find abundant and trustworthy data.

The Russells were a Puritan family, whose lives were marked by a sense of serious responsibility and purpose. Especially are we interested in John Thornton (Index here incomplete), the Puritan minister, who came to be tutor of Russell's children on leaving Cambridge in 1646, and became the friend and guide of successive generations of the family until his death in 1705. We like the answer of Rachel (aged 10, the daughter of William Russell, executed 1683) to Thornton's question, "What several heinous sins can you reckon up in our first parents eating that forbidden fruit?"

> Disbedince and angreatfulness and prid and unbeleaf and murder and senshuelety, steling, *ETC., ETC.*

In *The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642-1670* (Sheldon Press, 15s.) Mrs. Dorothy Gardiner follows up the selection of Oxinden letters she published four years ago. If readers will first master the genealogical table they will find their way through the book considerably eased. In some ways Mrs. Gardiner mystifies rather than clarifies. We do not, *e.g.*, understand her Preface. She says her previous volume was drawn from two volumes of MSS, B.M. Add. 27,999, 28,000, and that this volume is drawn from "the remaining five volumes (28,000-28,005)". 28,000-28,005 is of course six volumes, and we thought 28,000 was a misprint for 28,001, but Letters I-XLII are given from MS. 28,000. Research students who wish to refer to the MSS. must clear away this preliminary difficulty.

There are many points of interest in the letters, especially in those of the Civil War period (See "Worth Noting"); we see anxious attempts to be

neutral, and efforts by protagonists to save the property of friends on the opposite side from spoliation. Many details about the social life of the times fill out the picture. Henry Oxinden, himself, is a not unattractive figure; when his financial difficulties are engulfing him he takes Orders, and there is a revealing account of his struggles to obtain preferment. Once again the greatly respected Dissenting preacher appears, but Charles Nichols's letters are very sententious and prosy—though he seems to have been a faithful friend.

Dr. James Mackinnon calls his *Calvin and the Reformation* (Longmans, 16s.) a pendant to his work on Luther, and to some four volumes on Luther to one on Calvin will seem out of proportion. The present work is marked by the same characteristics as those from Dr. Mackinnon's pen which have preceded it: wide, thorough, and detailed knowledge, sound judgment, and the power of summing up a man or a situation in a few telling sentences. Dr. Mackinnon is aware of the blemishes in Calvin's character and in his work at Geneva, but he sees the qualities which made him a great man.

> Calvin was no prophet. But he was a constructive genius, in thought and action, of the first rank. . . The secret of his power lies in the fact that he united strength of character with a powerful mind and will and with depth and tenacity of religious conviction.

Dr. Mackinnon does well to emphasize that Calvin was the organizer rather than the author of the "inquisitorial *régime* at Geneva", and to expatiate on the style as well as the content of the *Institutes,* of which Chapters XVI and XVII give an admirable summary. One thing only we miss in a compact book—some discussion of the relation between Calvinism and Capitalism, of which so much has been heard recently: a footnote on Max Weber is all we have noticed.

We confess ourselves somewhat disappointed with M. Funck-Brentano's *Luther* (Cape, 15s.), translated from the French—and not always well translated, witness the last sentence on p. 226 and the sentences repeated on pp. 35 and 36, and elsewhere. M. Funck-Brentano has little that is new to say, and it is significant that his bibliography contains only French and German books—there is no mention of Dr. Mackinnon's work. Nor is he so vivacious as are some French writers. He fails to bring out the essential greatness of Luther's personality: seeing Luther primarily as one who believed himself inspired by God and beset by the devil, he indulges too much in ironic comment on the inconsistencies in his life and teaching. These are now frankly admitted on all sides: there is no possible defence, *e.g.*, of Luther's attitude to the peasants or of his condonation of the Landgrave Philip's bigamy, and his coarseness and invective must ever seem deplorable; but when all has been said in the way of criticism there remains the necessity of explaining Luther's great achievement, and here, despite the last chapters, this new biography fails us.

Dr. Duncan Anderson has made a considerable contribution to the study of the life of Scotland in the 17th century in *The Bible in 17th Century Scottish Life and Literature* (Allenson, 6s.). After showing how varying views of the Bible underlay the conflicts of religion, he examines spiritual and social life and the influence of the Bible on superstitious beliefs and practices, education, art, diction, and literature. Dr. Anderson has gathered together a vast amount of material, of which he has made a most interesting book. There are misprints on pp. 119 and 165.

Canada to M. André Siegfried is an absorbing study, for it is

> American geographically, British politically, largely French in origin, and yet world-wide in its international preoccupations,

and to understand it one "must examine English puritanism, the Anglican Church, and the French Catholic tradition". *Canada* (Cape, 10s. 6d.) may be considered as a sequel to *Le Canada, les Deux Races,* written thirty years ago. As the work of an observant Frenchman, it is of especial significance, and the chapters on the French Canadians are the best in the book. M. Siegfried surveys the political and economic life of the Dominion, and its attitude to Britain, Europe, and the United States. He is always suggestive, and he concludes that Canada, like Belgium, is a "precarious creation" and yet might carry on almost indefinitely. Surely M. Siegfried is not correct in saying that *half* the Presbyterians refused to enter the United Church. There is a misprint on p. 189.

Mr. Algernon Cecil has turned from Metternich, man of the world *par excellence,* to More, man of both worlds, saint, scholar, and prophet—and statesman to boot. Many lives of More have been written, from Roper's little gem to that of Prof. R. W. Chambers; to them Mr. Cecil has added his mammoth, thought not altogether superfluous, *Portrait of Thomas More* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 16s.). Mr. Cecil writes as a convinced Roman Catholic who believes More and Erasmus were right, and Luther and Calvin wrong, and that there is no half-way-house between their positions. As the work of an able writer who has read widely the biography deserves attention. Mr. Cecil loves to turn a phrase, but the machinery is a bit too obvious, and there will be many, like ourselves, who will find relief from his artificial, if expert, sentences in the charming simplicity of Roper.

Dr. R. Moffat Gillon's *John Davidson of Prestonpans* (Clarke, 6s.) leaves us at one and the same time grateful and dissatisfied. If we regard it merely as a biography we are grateful, for it gathers together most (not all) of what is known about one who deserves to rank with Knox and Andrew Melville among the most heroic fighters for the spiritual independence of the Church in Scotland. If we expect from it help in regard to English Puritanism, disappointment is our lot, for Dr. Gillon is evidently out of his depth when he leaves Davidson's life, narrowly conceived. There, especially in dealing with his hero's self-sacrificing ministry and his defiance of James, he is at home; in the wider history (we say nothing of slips like *Tencri*) the gaps in his knowledge are obvious. Clearly he has never read the Marprelate Tracts or studied the history of the Anabaptists; he quotes not from a MS. but from a *Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission* at secondhand; and on p. 212 he flounders about for an explanation as plain as a pikestaff to those familiar with *Homilies,* "dumbe dogs", and a "reading ministry". For one letter we are especially grateful, from Davidson to John Field, but about Browne and Penry in Scotland we learn little that is new. Perhaps we are unfair to expect so much from a biography, but Dr. Gillon must be blamed for arousing our expectations. He has certainly done well in telling the story of a stalwart Kirkman.

Is the Earl of Essex, we wonder, worth all the valuable time which Dr. G. B. Harrison has given to him in writing *The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex* (Cassell, 15s.)? Essex never seemed to become other than a spoilt and petulant youth, who loved to dramatize himself, and did so even on Tower Hill. It required a stronger character than his to live unscathed in the atmosphere of Gloriana's Court; nobody was more swayed by its jealousies and ambitions. We wish Dr. Harrison had told us more about the preachers who were about Essex during the last three months of his life, and had given the evidence to show that Abdy Ashton so far forgot himself as to employ his sacred office for political ends. We seem to have "feast" for "fast" on p. 10, and, we suspect "Morris" for

"Morrice" on p. 78. The volume is an able exposition of this text:

> Essex was always making the mistake of underrating the Queen, for he did not understand that beneath her peevishness and her infuriating vacillations and obstinacies there was the keenest political mind in Europe, vast experience of statecraft, and an uncanny power of estimating character.

To our surprise we found Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson's **A Study of Bossuet* (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.) one of the most fascinating books of the quarter. Dr. Sparrow Simpson says

> there can be little doubt that both for theological learning, eloquence, genius, personal ascendancy, and religious influence, Bossuet is the most outstanding priestly figure that the Church of France has produced.

This "study" deals with Bossuet as a theologian, and Free Churchmen would do well to read it: the chapters on Paul Ferry, the Conference with Claude, and the Variations of Protestantism, will be found full of significance for to-day. The quarrel with Fénelon furnishes a picture of intrigue and wirepulling about the Pope parallel to that described in Purcell's *Manning*.

The Rev. Edward Carpenter's *Thomas Sherlock, 1678-1761* (S.P.C.K., 15s.) is, like the last book, a publication of the Church Historical Society: we wish the Congregational Historical Society had two similar volumes to its credit in the same winter.

Sherlock was the son of "a strong defender of Church and Crown, and a vigorous opponent of the Dissenters". Bishop in turn of Bangor, Salisbury, and London, he declined both Archbishoprics. He was a political Churchman, and readers will learn much about both Church and State in the 18th century as they read: the Deistic controversy, the plantations, and the hostility between Bishops, Gibson and Sherlock in particular, occupy many pages. The book is not written with the same ease of style or mastery of matter as Dr. Sparrow Simpson's, but it collects the facts. Doddridge's name is always incorrectly spelled, and who is Benson, who makes a sudden appearance on p. 39?

Mr. C. E. Vulliamy is open to criticism on some grounds, but nobody can say that he is not an entertaining writer. His *Royal George* (Cape, 1s. 6d.) has a sub-title reminiscent of earlier days:

> A Study of King George III, his Experiment in Monarchy, his Decline and Retirement, with a View of Society, Politics and Historic Events During his Reign.

With a subject like George, Mr. Vulliamy's powers have full scope; it is not without significance that, after his satire on the obstinate monarch has had its fling, he suggests that the reader's final conclusions need not be uncharitable; "they may, indeed, be considerably modified by the promptings of pity". If the said reader accepts Mr. Vulliamy's sketch as being an impressionist picture rather than the work of a scientific historian, he will derive much pleasure and not be led far astray.

Mr. E. L. Griggs does not know quite how to handle words, but when he gets into his stride the interest of his *Thomas Clarkson, Friend of Slaves* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) carries the reader along. Once he dedicated his life to the cause of slaves Clarkson was an indefatigable worker, toiling in the background while Wilberforce bore the brunt of the fight in Parliament. Mr. Griggs describes the course of the struggle, and also the unhappy controversy which arose with Wilberforce's sons. The

interlude in the Lake District, when the Clarksons became intimate with the Wordsworths, is described in a chapter where Coleridge and Lamb also appear, while another chapter is given to Henry Christophe and Hayti. Mr. Griggs deserves credit for keeping his biography within reasonable bounds.

In *The Sugar Colonies and Governor Eyre, 1849-1866* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) Dr. W. L. Mathieson continues his study of slave emancipation and collateral questions. Examining the question whether the sugar colonies were ruined by emancipation or free trade, he concludes:

> What the planters were suffering from was not free trade but emancipation. All that the former had done was to throw down the façade of high prices which had concealed an impoverishment due to the scarcity of labour.

Half the book is dedicated to Jamaica and Governor Eyre. Dr. Mathieson comes down on the side of Eyre, and his comments on the Baptist missionaries are severe: we wonder how far the historians of the Baptist Missionary Society are prepared to accept his views. It is surprising to find no mention of Carlyle's views of Eyre and the Rebellion.

We imagine that many who do not read French will be annoyed that Mr. Arthur Tilley has not translated into English the many quotations from the letters incorporated in his readable and informing *Madame de Sévigné* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.); probably he knew too well the difficulty of finding adequate English. Mr. Tilley has given us not a biography but a few glimpses of one of the best letter-writers the world has known. We see her in Paris and in the country, as a friend and a collector and transmitter of news, and among her books. All who read French will greatly enjoy Mr. Tilley's chapters. Crabb Robinson gets, as often, an additional "e".

Still another volume is devoted to Robinson—"Diarist with a big D" and "a satellite of men of genius" (Arthur Ponsonby), and a "Nestor of observation" (Richard Garnett). There is, of course, a good deal about him in *Thomas Clarkson,* for he was a great friend of Mrs. Clarkson and the champion of her husband against the attacks of Wilberforce's sons. Now Dr. J. M. Baker's *Henry Crabb Robinson* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.), based on the manuscripts in Dr. Williams's Library which Miss Edith Morley made so well known, is a study which conveys even yet more information about one who played many parts. Perhaps the chapter which deserves most attention is that describing Robinson's work as Foreign Correspondent and Editor of *The Times.* We have now had a good deal about Robinson as journalist, author, lawyer, and friend of the great literary figures of the day; will not some Nonconformist write about him as Dissenter? There should be ample material along this line—and in the life of Samuel Rogers—for the research student. Robinson throughout his long life remained a bachelor. Perhaps this sentence from a letter affords sufficient explanation:

> I have just spent two evenings with Miss Wakefield, a charming girl, whom I should be glad to fall in love with, if it would be convenient.

Robinson, who at one point in his life suspected he had suffered from his carelessness in dress, is called by Mr. Townsend Scudder, the author of *The Lonely Wayfaring Man* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.) "the most fastidious of hosts". Mr. Scudder writes of Emerson and the Englishmen with whom he came into contact, from the first fruitless visits to Landor, Coleridge, and Wordsworth to the more or less intimate friendships with Carlyle—the book is almost as much about Carlyle as about Emerson—

Clough, and Allingham. Written in a chatty and agreeable style, Mr. Scudder's pages will give pleasure to many readers.

Methodists and musicians—especially musicians—will read with pleasure Mr. J. T. Lightwood's *Samuel Wesley, Musician* (Epworth Press, 6s.). Samuel, the talented but erratic son of Charles Wesley, and the father of Samuel Sebastian Wesley, was an organist and composer who fell just so far short of genius that he never escaped the ranks of impecunious musicians. An unhappy marriage, combined with unusual ideas about matrimony and religion, prevented preferment from coming his way. His best claim to fame is the part he played in making Bach known in England.

The Rev. H. G. Mulliner's memoir, *Arthur Burroughs* (Nisbet, 5s.) is exactly right—right length, right tone, right balance. He lets us see the qualities which made Burroughs a scholar and a war-time prophet, as well as the defects which made episcopal office a burden. Fellow of Hertford and Proctor, Dean of Bristol, and Bishop of Ripon, Burroughs was never a strong man physically—he died at 51. In all his offices his personality made itself felt, and for a few brief years he voiced the idealism which for many found expression in the call to national service. To the disillusioned post-war generation he was, however, a voice crying in the wilderness : they used another language and were obsessed with problems of which Burroughs knew nothing. Had his Church allowed him to be an inspirer—and he had the power to help the young in Schools and Universities as few could—he would have done great work ; but she sentenced him to imprisonment on the Episcopal Bench, and very unhappy he was.

In the recent death of W. H. Lax, Methodism lost one of its most striking figures : for 35 years he had worked in Poplar, and through his books and lectures the Poplar Mission ("Lax's") had become known far and wide. The value of his autobiography, *Lax His Book* (Epworth Press, 5s.) lies in the description of his youth and his picture of Methodism in Lancashire in his boyhood days. It is a moot question whether Lax would have been able to do more had he not worked so hard ; he says :

> I have always been too busy to play games. Even now I do not know a single game. As for card games, I do not know one card from another. I never had a hobby. I have none now—except my work.

However the question be answered, there will be general agreement about the wholeheartedness of his consecration, and a welcome for this book.

Mr. Alexander Gammie was to be envied his subject when asked to write the life of William Quarrier, the George Müller of Scotland. Born in poverty in 1829 Quarrier gave his life to the care of the neglected child and the sufferer from consumption and epilepsy. As a result of his labours a whole town of cottage homes, *etc.*, was erected at Bridge of Weir. Without appealing for subscriptions he relied on prayer and faith, and all needs were met as they arose. **William Quarrier and the Story of the Orphan Homes of Scotland* (Pickering, 2s. 6d.) is a moving and inspiring story.

Mr. Horace Wyndham's *Mr. Sludge, The Medium* (Bles, 12s. 6d.) relates "the life and adventures" of Daniel Dunglas Home. Mr. Wyndham has no doubts at all about spiritualism, or about Home : he gives his irony full play in describing what he believes to be fraud and trickery. The gullibility of scientists like Wallace, Crookes, and Barrett and the credibility of men and women in all ranks of society afford him ample scope. "King of the mediums", and "friend of the spirits", Home had a way with him : Emperors and Empresses invited him to conduct *séances;* he collected jewels and presents from many quarters, and he married two Russian ladies of aristocratic birth. Browning's brusque repudiation of his gifts

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley

expressed a common opinion of Home, though his wife represented the minority who were carried away by him. A readable story.

Readers of the *Letters of Gertrude Bell* were thrilled to learn that another volume of her letters was on the way, and they will eagerly open *The Earlier Letters of Gertrude Bell* (Benn, 15s.). Skilfully edited by her sister, Lady Richmond—though there is an incorrect date on p. 302—they show the radiant youth of a forceful personality. The letters at School and at Oxford seem to us the pick of the book : they afford an admirable period picture of female education; we can imagine, however, that some readers will prefer those written from Bucharest at the age of 20, or from Persia at the age of 24. In both places she was staying with her uncle, Sir Frank Lascelles, the British Minister, and we get a "close-up" of legation life. The letters end with Gertrude's love affair with Henry Cadogan : had he lived it is probable that her life would have taken a course far different from the one which brought her fame.

The Rev. Denis Gildea's *Mother Mary Arsenius of Foxford* (Burns Oates, 6s.) is a biography of Agnes Morrogh Bernard (1842-1932), who, early conscious of a religious vocation, became a Sister of Charity, and then in turn a teacher, Mother Superior of a Convent, and founder of a woollen factory at Foxford. To Protestants the book will throw much light on Roman Catholicism in Ireland, and they will discount its strong bias. Mother Arsenius was a believer in prayer—she believed that several times her illnesses were miraculously cured—a good organizer, and a brave woman—witness the report she wrote on the conduct of the Black and Tans.

No more important series of lectures has been delivered at the Geneva Institute of International Relations than the 11th, now published under the title *The League and the Future of the Collective System* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.). Mr. Herbert Morrison opened, and there were other British speakers, but the lectures by the German and the Russian representatives—Dr. Fritz Berber's "The Third Reich and the Future of the Collective System" and Mr. Andrew Rothstein's "The Soviet Union in International Affairs"—are those which give the reader most furiously to think. The glaring diversity between these two appears almost throughout the volume, whether the discussion turn on colonies, the reform of the League, or national self-sufficiency. The lectures deserve careful study.

Another "Foreword" writer who does not seem to have studied the work he prefaces is Sir Edward Grigg, who introduces Mr. Neil Macaulay's *Mandates: Reasons, Results, Remedies* (Methuen, 6s.), which has two bad blunders of fact in its first ten pages. Mr. Macaulay is of the Amery-Churchill School; to him the League of Nations is "dying, damned and doomed", the "Baldwin-Eden attachment to the League" "folly", and any talk of giving up British mandates "insane surrender". The tone of the book may be gauged from Mr. Macaulay's belief in a "world hegemony of Judaeo-Masonry", and from claptrap like

> Ye gods and little London County school-teachers !

There is room for a survey of mandated territories at the present time, and signs in the present book that Mr. Macaulay could have set forth the facts; it is a pity he has produced instead a party pamphlet.

Commander Stephen King-Hall, as versatile as he is indefatigable, tries yet another venture in *King-Hall Survey, 1936* (Newnes, 6s.), which he proposes to make an annual publication. This "Summary" and "Interpretation" represent what we in our pages call "Life" and "Thought"; and after Art, Entertainment, Sport, we have a Necrology, Time Charts,

Chronology, and 200 illustrations. It is safe to say that if Commander King-Hall cannot make a success of a volume of this kind, nobody else will.

What is the thread which unites Dr. Maude Royden, Dr. L. P. Jacks, Prof. A. E. Richardson, the Marquis of Tavistock, Mr. C. R. W. Nevinson, Captain Bernard Acworth, and Sir E. Denison Ross? We defy anyone to tell from reading the symposium, *Seven Pillars of Fire* (Jenkins, 8s. 6d.). The Christian religion, the right use of leisure, a planned economy, social credit, freedom in the arts (Mr. Nevinson's—a lively and stimulating contribution), the "fantastic theory of evolution" and 1,001 other things (Capt. Acworth), and Utopia in general—is there anything which gives unity to such a miscellaneous collection?

One of the most entertaining books this quarter is Mr. Carl Carmer's *Listen for a Lonesome Drum* (Cassell, 10s. 6d.), an informing and well-written account of life "upstate". Even Americans sometimes let New York City overshadow New York State, and we in this country often forget that that State is the size of England, and is equally varied in its scenery and its inhabitants. Of the legends and traditions, and the past and present life of its people — including Indians yet remaining — Mr. Carmer writes in a racy fashion which should not conceal the industry with which he has collected his material or its value to historians. Of "fancy religions", such as the Shakers and the Oneida Community, he gives sympathetic sketches, while there are vivid pictures of rattlesnake catching and cock-fighting (the latter a horrible business). The chapters contain some excellent stories, some of them of the Munchausen variety. Mr. Carmer seems to have found his niche in books of this kind, and we hope we shall see more of them.

Miss Hilda Trevelyan has become a vigorous champion of the animals, and *Laugh, Clown, Laugh!* (Daniel, 3s. 6d.) is a successor to *Heaven's Rage*. We are entirely in sympathy with Miss Trevelyan's campaign, and wish that all people could be made to read—and feel—what she has to say about animals in captivity, hunting, trapping ("Victims of Vanity"), faked films, and performing animals. At times Miss Trevelyan's indignation leads her to extravagance, which is a pity, for she should give no handle to the callous and indifferent. To say that "a man who has no dog, who dislikes dogs, or is discomfited by their presence can never be a thoroughly 'decent fellow' " is to play into the enemies' hands.

Mr. G. K. Hibbert is editing the "Firbank Series" for Messrs. Allenson (2s. 6d.). The first volumes consist of eight *Short Stories*, and eight *One-Act Plays*.

We found ourselves held much more by *The British Civil Servant* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) than we anticipated. Edited by Dr. W. A. Robson, who contributes the opening essay, "The Public Service", it consists of a series of studies by well-equipped writers on the various branches of that service. The volume is not limited to the Home (Sir Ernest Barker), Foreign (Mr. Harold Nicolson), Indian (Prof. Coatman), and Colonial (Mr. Leonard Barnes) Services, but it includes Local Government (whereon Sir Ernest Simon and Mr. L. Hill do not always agree) and the Semi-Public services (an outspoken article, especially on the B.B.C., by Mr. Herman Finer). Various aspects of the subject are dealt with by other writers, including Mrs. Ray Strachey, who cannot make up her mind how to spell "celibate", and altogether the volume provides a valuable and informing survey. Dr. Robson's book is both informing and readable. Mr. K. B. Smellie's *A Hundred Years of English Government* (Duckworth, 15s.), which covers part of the same ground, is also informing, but at times not so readable.

Mr. Smellie scarcely gives himself a fair chance, as his first paragraph is about the worst in the book, and he continually annoys the reader by putting his references at the end of the chapters instead of at the foot of the page. He also casts his net far too wide, so that though discussing Darwin's *Descent of Man* he leaves no room for Lord Hewart's *The New Despotism,* and in examining "the changing face of industry and trade, the new worlds of science, and the mutations of society" obscures some of the sound points about administrative government it was his business to make. There is obvious bias and some mistakes, one even for the sake of alliteration, as when he makes a Duke and not Lord Randolph Churchill refer to decimal points as "damned dots". This having been said, it can be frankly admitted that there will be few who will not learn from Mr. Smellie's account of the growth of the work of the State since 1832. If sometimes he is walking on a well-trodden path, he often notices things that are often overlooked. How many of us remember, for example, that while the Reform Bill of 1832 added 217,000 to the electorate of 500,000, changing economic conditions brought 600,000 more within the prescribed qualifications in the next generation?

In *Shakespeare Criticism* (Oxford Press, "World's Classics", 2s.) Miss Anne Bradby has collected some recent essays. The writers include Mr. J. M. Robertson, Dr. Caroline Spurgeon, Mr. W. W. Greg, Mr. H. Granville-Barker, Mr. T. S. Eliot, Mr. Middleton Murry, Prof. H. B. Charlton, Dr. G. B. Harrison, and Mr. Edmund Blunden.

Why does Sir John Squire turn to yet another American in the "English Men of Letters" series? Are all English writers exhausted? And why, we wonder, was Mr. Edward Shanks chosen to write *Edgar Allan Poe* (Macmillan, 6s.)? And why does Mr. Shanks begin with a chapter which assumes that readers are quite familiar with Poe's life and writings? And what is the meaning of the remarkable but ambiguous statement that the Inquisition never "inflicted any torture save that of the final fire on the condemned heretic"? And does Mr. Shanks really think his last chapter justifies his view that "Poe's influence on the intellectual life of the later 19th century is admittedly enormous"? Here are sufficient questions to be going on with.

To learn that finds like the thirty-one *Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.), now published for the first time, are still possible will give a tremendous impetus to research students. The letters, which date from Keats's departure for Italy to his sister's coming of age in 1824, are remarkable productions for a girl of 20; they cannot be better described than in the words of Mr. Fred Edgcumbe, the Curator of the Keats Museum, who edits them:

> These letters show Fanny Brawne, who was but twenty years of age, as a young woman of remarkable perception and imagination, keen in the observance of character and events, possessing an unusual critical faculty, and intellectually fitted to become the wife of Keats.

Prof. H. Augustine Smith's *The New Hymnal for Youth* (Appleton, 4s. 6d.) has now been published on this side of the Atlantic, and those who know the editor's work, or remember his conduct of the music at the International Congregational Council at Boston in 1920, will examine it with pleasurable anticipation. They will not be disappointed, for the selection, which is compiled for "Intermediates, Seniors, and Young People", is worthy to compare with *School Worship*. There are some good modern hymns, some of them by American ministers well known in this country, and also responsive readings (always a feature of American public worship),

litanies, orders of worship, and most interesting selections of "Prayers and High Resolves" and "Devotional Poetry and Prose".

The Rev. J. W. James, who scored a bull's-eye with *Listening In,* his first volume of children's addresses, has now gathered together thirty more in *The Golden Touch* (Indep. Press, 2s. 6d.).

The title of the Rev. Ronald W. Thomson's *Modern Saints and Heroes* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) speaks for itself. The book contains 26 talks to boys and girls on people like Aggrey, Grenfell, Lindbergh, Helen Keller, Kagawa, and Schweitzer.

Dr. A. E. Ikin's *Religious Instruction* (Nelson, 2s. 6d.) is Book I of a series intended for use with the "Agreed Syllabuses" of religious education. This deals with the difficult period up to seven years of age. The suggested syllabus and subjects are preceded by an admirable discussion of child psychology and the right way of giving religious instruction to children of this age.

Of the three new volumes in the Everyman's Library (Dent, 2s. each) special mention must be made of Mr. G. Lacey May's admirable selection of *English Religious Verse,* which contains not merely the old favourites one expects to find, but one or two examples of moderns like T. S. Eliot. Of the other volumes, Voltaire's *Candide and Other Tales* and Mr. Aldous Huxley's *Stories, Essays, and Poems,* the latter contains so much that the print is unduly small.

In *The Exile* Mrs. Pearl Buck told the story of the life of her mother, the heroic woman who, mated with a missionary who lived only for his work, laid down her life in China. Now in *Fighting Angel* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) she gives us the "portrait of the soul" of the missionary himself. Narrow, intolerant, consecrated, Andrew forgets everything and everybody, himself included, in his work : wife, children, homeland, all were as naught—only the winning of Chinese for Christ mattered. Whether on balance a life of this kind counts for Christendom is a subject for argument : the reader is moved by Andrew's self-sacrifice while he is irritated by his lack of thought for those near to him.

Miss Sylvia Stevenson's *The Flowering Aloe* (Cape, 7s. 6d.) is a powerful but depressing story of modern life. Selina Chantry, a widow of 59 whose children are now living their own lives, tries spiritualism and specialists—fancy religions and fancy doctors—in the endeavour to find satisfaction. The children—in the film world, the motor trade, and welfare work—live in the rush and scurry and the sex-obsession of the nineteen thirties, and the girl's experience is particularly saddening. Miss Stevenson has gifts which we hope she will employ on more cheerful people.

Mr. George A. Birmingham's enjoyment in writing *Mrs. Miller's Aunt* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) will be shared by his readers. It tells how Father Nolan, with the help of other members of the "Old Buffers' Club", rescued the wife of a fellow-member from a dominating and wealthy old aunt, given to fads. There will be many a chuckle before nature comes to the help of Father Nolan and effects the emancipation of Mrs. Miller and her husband.

John Harlaw conceals—or reveals—a Congregational minister who knows both Scotland and Canada. His novel, *Glenlyon* (Stockwell, 3s. 6d.) tells of life in Glasgow slums and in Canada. If coincidence is rather overdone it is interesting to see the reaction of a small Canadian community to Church Union proposals.

EDITOR.

Dr. F. H. Hallock is an American and his *The Gift of the Holy Ghost* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) is a reprint of articles which appeared in the *American*

Church Monthly. It is intended to supplement teaching in preparation for Confirmation and is written from a very definitely Anglo-Catholic point of view. It expounds the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in terms of the crudest orthodoxy and of a conception of God which is indistinguishable from tritheism. It is a good example of what Professor Pringle-Pattison calls

> the materialism which has succeeded in transforming the profound doctrine of the Spirit as the ultimate expression of the communion of God and man into the notion of another distinct being, a third centre of consciousness mysteriously united with the other two.

It is quite consonant with this interpretation that this book should go on to describe the gifts of the Holy Ghost as those of understanding, wisdom, knowledge, counsel, holy fear, godliness and ghostly strength. These seem a rather curious substitute for the Pauline catalogue—love, joy, peace, *etc.*—but they certainly give the writer a better opportunity of vindicating his particular type of Christianity. How near this can come to superstition is seen in his view on p. 46 of the secret and almost magical quality of the number seven. The book contains some wise counsels and some shrewd criticisms of conventional religion, but presents on the whole a one-sided view of Christianity.

Dr. C. A. Strong is an American psychologist turned philosopher. He is already responsible for two books on "the origin of mind and consciousness" in which he defends the position that mind is a product of evolution, and he has now written *A Creed for Sceptics* (Macmillan, 6s.), summing up and emphasizing his conclusions. The book is rather an odd mixture. The first chapter sets forth the author's theory of knowledge. This is followed by a much longer chapter etitled "Elucidations", which consists of a number of notes or short essays on points of difficulty raised by the first chapter. Next comes a chapter in French entitled "*L'Etre et le Devenir*"; this is followed by a short dialogue by Voltaire on Free Will; and then comes a final chapter which gives its title to the book — "A Creed for Sceptics". Twice in the course of the book Dr. Strong, like Mr. Silas Wegg, drops into poetry, without, however, shedding much further light on his argument.

The theory of knowledge set forth its author describes as critical realism and a defence against philosophic doubt:

> Things are real and perception is a knowing of them. But our knowledge seems to be entirely limited to the universe which always existed and always will exist, as boundless in space and endless in time.

So, as Dr. Strong says, "The universe seems to me to be self-sufficient in its nature and a going concern, and the idea of anything outside it to be baseless and illusory". Just what part man has in the universe beyond being an observer Dr. Strong never seems to make clear. He believes in freedom, conscience, and goodness, and so long as man recognizes the difference between good and evil it does not seem to matter that nature is indifferent. Morals rest on a sound basis of experience, and the best half of religion, what Dr. Strong calls the non-superstitious half, consists in prosecuting moral ends.

We cannot say that this book is successful in seeking to maintain man's moral freedom under a purely materialist view of the universe. The problem of the relation between mind and matter still remains. EDITOR.

Dr. John Short, of Hampstead, in his little book, *Can I Find Faith?* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.), addresses himself to the multitudes of distressed and

bewildered people who are to be found in these days both within and without the Christian churches. His message to them is simple, direct, and constructive, and constitutes a really pertinent and attractive defence and exposition of the Christian faith. His subjects comprise Man's Quest for and Relation with God, Faith, Prayer, Power, Temptation, Courage and the like. Dr. Short's treatment of them is always interesting and intelligible, and he has a real gift for apt quotation. The Student Movement Press has done well to publish these papers, and it is to be hoped that they will have a large circulation, especially in the student world.

Mr. J. H. Best is a scientist as well as a theologian and in *The Miracles of Christ* (S.P.C.K., 6s.) his whole approach to the question of the miraculous has therefore a freshness and interest of its own. He is impressed with the enormous advances which have been made of late years in our knowledge of the physical universe. Nature and the uniformity of nature no longer mean what they once did and modern discovery in astronomy and physics only serves to show that there are more things in heaven and earth than our philosophy has yet realized. The merely mechanical view of the universe is now entirely out of date and most people would agree with Sir James Jeans that "the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine". Mind no longer appears like an intruder into the realm of matter. We are beginning to suspect that we are rather to hail it as the creator and governor of the realm of matter. If these things are so, then the way is more open for the conception of God not merely as the Creator of the universe but as its Sustainer, working in and through it to reveal His power and His will. Mr. Best, therefore, argues that the old rationalism which agreed with Matthew Arnold that miracles do not happen is no longer tenable, and that it is no longer possible to argue *a priori* that miracles are impossible. In the light of this conclusion he goes on to discuss the question of the actual occurrence of the miracles attributed to Our Lord. He discusses the New Testament evidence, divides the miracles into various classes, indicating that in all probability some of them were not "miracles" in the strict sense of the term, and concludes with a long discussion of the Resurrection and Ascension. His treatment of this part of the subject follows the usual lines, but it is always open-minded and discriminating. Possibly he may sometimes try to prove a little too much. In any case, however, his book is a really fresh and useful contribution to the subject.

We Beheld His Glory (S.P.C.K., 5s.) is a translation by Miss Ewer of a book which Professor N. Arseniev wrote in German in the interests of Christian reunion as seen from the standpoint of the Orthodox Church. He speaks of it "as an attempt to describe certain religious trends and phenomena of our times as having their roots in the concrete poignancy and the overwhelming power of the primitive Christian Apostolic message—the message of victory". So he deals in turn with such subjects as the Realism of Early Christianity in its bearing on the general religious situation of to-day: as it is expressed in (1) modern Protestant theology, (2) the Johannine vision of glory in the Eastern Church, (3) the Incarnation theology of modern Anglicanism, (4) the German High Church Movement, and (5) some tendencies of modern Roman Catholicism; and the book ends with a brief discussion of the Ecumenical Movement. The descriptive part is extremely interesting as giving the impressions of a devout member of the Eastern Orthodox Church. It brings out the many points of unity that already exist among the deeply divided sections of Christendom, and it enables the reader to realize in a very vivid way the dangers to which organized religion is exposed in this post-war world. It certainly stresses

the necessity for reunion, but it will raise a doubt in the minds of many as to whether the only kind of reunion visualized by the author is either possible or desirable.

W. B. Selbie.

Mr. L. Wyatt Lang's *Christ's Psychology of the Kingdom* (Group Publications, 8s. 6d.) is described as "a new reading of the Gospels in the light of modern psychology, and an explanation of the system of Jesus". The author has a very considerable equipment as a psychologist, far beyond anything I possess; it is with hesitation I hazard an opinion. But the feeling this book produces in me is that a more everyday reading of the Gospels promises more helpful results. Try how one will, there comes a point when one rebels against the very terms of the subject—"personality-fixation", "transference processes", and "psychormas", the last a term of Mr. Lang's own coining, which he hopes will improve on acquaintance. From the argument of the book it seems that Christ was a "new psychologist", with a well-thought-out system of His own, and a scientific mind. I am bound to say this is not the impression I get from the Gospels. Christ was much more of a poet than a scientist. He knew what was in man; but it was not a knowledge which He gained, I feel sure, by these methods. Speaking of Christ's ideas of God's character as having come to Him as discoveries of what God meant to Him as His Father, the author goes on to say that "under the influence of the father-fixation Christ worked out the psychological system, observations, and ethics which we have been considering". With much respect for the writer's learning, I could as soon believe that Christ worked out for Himself the principles of modern astronomy. And when Mr. Lang says of the words "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden", that they are Christ's appeal to the disciples "to make this fixation by a love-nexus", I confess it is a world in which my mind does not move, and that it seems to me an instance of how an excess of scholarship sometimes loses the light of common day.

The Rev. J. W. Stevenson's *The Incredible Church* (Clarke, 3s. 6d.) is a strong appeal for the recovery of the primitive Gospel within the Church. At its centre the Church must have the Cross, and this must inform its whole life, and shape the types of individual character. All this is worked out with passionate sincerity. In the later chapters Mr. Stevenson enters upon social matters. There may be two opinions about some of these things; but the book itself will come home to every earnest Christian mind.

Miss Eleanor C. Merry's *The Flaming Door* (Rider, 12s. 6d.) is not an easy book to write about for anyone who is not enamoured of the "Occult". But it is a readable book, and its treatment of Celtic mysteries, and of old-world legends, is competent and interesting. All lovers of folk-lore will find something to please them. I fancy the more commonplace reader will find a difficulty in stringing his mind up to so much belief in lost magic. And Miss Merry has evidently a much greater confidence in the dependence of Christianity on the old mystery religions than a sound criticism will admit. Still, this is a book worth reading; though one needs more than a normal dose of credulity to accept all its conclusions.

The Rev. Walter Bugden's *Confidence* (Stockwell, 4s.) is a volume of sermons preached by him in his capacity as a Mission priest in the diocese of Newfoundland. They claim to be "couched in homely and Colonial style". None of his hearers could have any doubt what Mr. Bugden meant: there is a note of genuineness running right through them.

The Rev. Frank H. Ballard's *The Desire of All Nations* (Indep. Press, 3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.) is apparently in part a selection of sermons; they are

gathered about the principle that "in Christ we have the key to life's mysteries", and they illustrate this principle by clear instances, as, *e.g.*, the Easter address on "Recognition of the Living Christ". Here is good preaching of a kind not too common; it draws its power from a store of reading, but especially from an evident spiritual experience which gives the book a very welcome note of Christian confidence.

A. T. S. JAMES.

I heartily commend *Religion and Reality* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) by Mr. M. Chaning-Pearce. It is a product not of the lamp and the lexicon, but of life; it is clearly and persuasively written, and with a wide knowledge of literature. If it provokes furious opposition, at least it deals with real issues. Mr. Chaning-Pearce is troubled by the divorce of mind and heart so evidently frustrating modern life. He sees this cleavage in the distinction between the Jesus of history—the bare facts that radical scholars leave us—and the Christ of faith, the object of religious devotion. For him the Christian ethic with its stringent demands is not tenable unless the Christian eschatology—the breaking in of another order of reality—is true. Reality is reached only if the Incarnation is actual fact. And we assent to the Incarnation not by the logical reason, but by the "existential" judgment, the wisdom of practical life, which teaches us that when we are most passionately aware that life is real we know the breaking-in of another order. I thoroughly agree with the author's main contention, though I think that many of his antitheses are strained and that his thought is scarred by the tumult of his own experience. But the book is searching and important.

Thought and Reality—Hegelianism and Advaita (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), by Mr. P. T. Raju, a pupil of Sir S. Radhakrishnan, may be of service to philosophical students of Indian thought or of Absolute Idealism. Dr. Raju upholds Sankara's philosophy by means of a criticism of Hegel and Bradley. The Absolute is supra-rational Intuition, and has no conceivable relation to the finite world. Existence = Truth = Reality. Individuals are different phenomenally but the same noumenally. As the Absolute is unaffected by the world, which cannot be deduced from it, nor taken up into it, we must make use of *māyā*, or the principle of inexplicability. "*Māyā* is that which appears as existing and yet is negated on its own basis as never existing." The criticism of Hegel from the basis of a realist theory of knowledge is well done; but to a non-Hegelian the main assumptions of this philosophy—the apotheosis of the Negative Way—are quite unacceptable, and some of it seems complete nonsense. A generous use of *māyā* could prove anything. As a contribution to "comparative philosophy" the book would be more useful if Hegelianism had a greater hold on present-day Western thought.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Dr. Louis Arnaud Reid's *Creative Morality* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) is one of the best books on Moral Philosophy that I have read in recent years. It is very readable and yet it gives the serious student plenty of food for thought. Dr. Reid deals with his subject in concrete fashion. He is out of sympathy with the abstract methods of the logical analysts. His own approach may be summed up in his own words:

> the concepts of what is commonly called morality, though "clear" enough for ordinary practical purposes, will be, thus far, abstract and unreal, and to understand them properly we shall have to re-intuit, re-think, and re-state them in relation to a larger context where man's life is not a thing of habit or rule or presented law, but of inspiration and freedom.

Dr. Reid achieves this in a satisfying manner.

There is some acute criticism of contemporary ethical theories, especially those of Ross and Prichard, as well as others. He re-examines the relationship between "means and end", "motive and intention", and clarifies the ethical notions of Right, Good, Duty, and Motive. There is a most interesting chapter on "Duty and Love". Here *agape* as a transforming agent is described as unique.

The general reader will be deeply interested in the discussion of the question of the autonomy of morals and the relation between religion, especially Christianity, and morals. This section is very satisfying. Religion exercises an enlarging function in the moral life and strengthens its roots. The book may be commended to both the student and the general reader.

Mr. Gordon S. Jury's *Value and Ethical Objectivity* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is an important book for all students of philosophy, especially of ethics. It is a thorough-going realistic examination of the ontological status of spiritual values, and it seeks to set forth their objectivity. The author does a great deal to clear away many ambiguities in the current use of the philosophic concepts involved. He subjects various modern theories to a searching scrutiny and is careful to distinguish the physical and psychological conditions of our value-judgments from their objective reference. He classifies the various theories of value into three groups: Inclusive, Restrictive, and Exclusive. In the end he reaches idealistic conclusions and lays a firm foundation for theism. This is a book for the more advanced student and it presupposes a fairly wide knowledge of modern theories. I most heartily recommend it.

In *The Philosophy of James Ward* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.) Dr. A. H. Murray, of the University of Witwaterstrand, has given us a clear and complete account of the philosophy of James Ward. He points out that Ward's philosophic teaching was based on his psychology, was empirical in method and outlook, and was valuable as a criticism of the abstract tendencies both of Absolute Idealism and of Naturalism. For Ward, Theory of Knowledge is fundamental, and the leading principle is to keep close to experience. Ward's affinities with the teaching of Leibnitz are clearly shown and also the points of difference. Whilst Dr. Murray's treatment is on the whole favourable, he does not fail to point out the weakness of Ward's pampsychism and of his general position.

All three books have a useful index.

JOHN SHORT.

The Heritage of the Cathedral (Methuen, 16s.) by Mr. Sartell Prentice, is not an easy book to review fairly. It is "a study of the influence of history and thought upon cathedral architecture" and aims at describing the background of pagan faith and worship, still dimly expressing itself in medieval architecture, as well as the more contemporary needs and interests which directly controlled the architecture's evolution. The author, who is an American, has travelled 50,000 miles in order to see things for himself, and the books from which he quotes are recognized authorities (*e.g.*, Mâle and Kingsley Porter). He writes imaginatively, but it is here that his danger lies: ch. XXI shows that he is no extreme "symbolist", but even so one feels uncomfortably that the terms in which he sees the cathedral's development are too primarily "sombre", "soaring", and "dancing". The pictures are excellent both as photographs and as illustrations of the text; to find the passages they illustrate the index must be used.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

ALSO RECEIVED.

Two admirably edited Conference Reports which contain food for thought are *Christ the Hope of the World* (W.S.S.A., 3s. 6d.), the Report of the 12th World's Sunday School Convention, Oslo, 1936, edited by Mr. Alexander Gammie, and *God Speaks to This Generation* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), the addresses delivered at the Birmingham Quadrennial Students' Conference.

PETER FLETCHER. *Mastering Life.* Rich & Cowan. 2s. 6d. "Needs of Today" Series.

The Passion and Glorious Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Herbert Joseph. 2s., 3s. 6d., 5s. Extracts from the New Testament dealing with the Passion and Resurrection. Coronation Souvenir Edition.

LILIAN E. COX. *High Days and Holy Days.* N.S.S.U. 1s. 6d. Stories for Children of Varying Ages for Christian Festivals and other special occasions.

DAVID WILLIAMSON. *King George and His Queen.* Pilgrim Press. 2s.

E. BENDOR SAMUEL. *The Blessing of the Tribes.* Pickering. 2s.

GEORGE GOODMAN. *I Live—Yet Not I.* Pickering. 1s.

ERNEST H. HAYES. *Drum-Skin Trophy; The Cheese-Factor's Vow.* Ludgate Circus House. 2d. each. Nos. 3 & 4 in the "All-True" Library.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (January). A valuable number opens with a pronouncement by Karl Barth on the Group Movement, which comes down very strongly on the side of the Church rather than the Group. The Rev. F. Brompton Harvey's "Coincidence—and its Use by Thomas Hardy" is suggestive, and there are other interesting contributions. Dr. W. F. Howard's "Some Recent Foreign Contributions to New Testament Study" is useful.

The Hibbert Journal (January). There are more gleanings from Dr. Inge's notebook, and the Rev. J. M. Connell has an interesting article on Thomas Paine. Dr. Micklem's address to the Dissenting Deputies on "Our Genevan Inheritance" is printed, and another Congregational contributor is Dr. W. G. Moore, who writes on Charles Morgan's *Sparkenbroke.* Miss Muriel Kent writes on "Jane Addams", the Rev. David Cairns on Blumhardt of Möttlingen, and Mr. F. S. Marvin on "Humanity". Dr. Moffatt surveys recent theological literature.

The Baptist Quarterly (January). There are interesting recollections of S. A. Tipple by the Revs. S. Pearce Carey and E. J. Roberts, and the Rev. J. N. Schofield has a useful sketch, "The Arab and the Jew in Palestine". Dr. Townley Lord writes on "The Achievement of Personality in a Material World", and the Rev. Carey Bonner on "Some Baptist Hymnists". There is a long article, of value to historians, on "Dissent and Republicanism after the Restoration" by Dr. J. Walker.

The Layman (January). This is the journal of the Baptist Laymen's Missionary Movement, formerly called *The Baptist Layman.* It will be interesting to see if a journal of this kind can make its way. It prefers finance to appearance, for it carries advertisements on the same pages as its articles. A timely article is Mr. Norman F. Spurr's "The Film and Religion".

The Modern Churchman (December-February). A good deal of attention is paid by the Editor to the split in the movement. The Archbishop of Canterbury's New Year broadcast also comes in for comment. Archdeacon Brook's sermon, "The Menace of Gambling", well deserves reading.

The Church Quarterly Review (January). Mr. Douglas Woodruff writes on "The Report on Church and State", Canon W. J. Phythian-Adams on *"Deuteronomy"*, Dr. F. A. M. Spencer on "The Atoning Death", and the Rev. A. S. Turberville on "The Episcopal Bench, 1783-1837". The Bishop of Gloucester discusses the World Conference on Faith and Order.

The Christian Quarterly (January). The Editor continues his sketch of "The Word of God and the Apostolicity of the Church". A Baptist minister and an Anglican clergyman have a dialogue on "The Outlook for Religion". There is an Open Letter about the Groups, and an article from America on "Whither Religion?".

Social Service Review (December-February). Sir Malcolm Stewart's Report on the Special Areas is discussed, and there is a specially good article on the School Camps Service of the National Council of Social Service.

Religion in Education (January). Articles of practical value are the Headmaster of Winchester's "Christianity and Citizenship", Mr. Arthur Mayhew's "The Comparative Study of Religions in Schools", Mr. W. Frazer Mitchell's "The New German Religion and Its Implications for Religious Education", and the Rev. H. M. P. Davidson's "A Syllabus for Sacred Studies", which gives special attention to the Vth and VIth forms.

The Expository Times (January-March). It is almost impossible to select from the many excellent articles in these three issues. In the "Best Books" series Dr. Wheeler Robinson deals with the Old Testament, Prof. John Baillie with the Philosophy of Religion, and Dr. Vincent Taylor with the Atonement. Mr. H. G. Wood writes on "The

Tenth Commandment", Dr. Dakin on "The Teaching of Theology", and Canon Quick on "Christian Theology and Moral Principles".

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (First Month). A number which shows that the Friends maintain their interests—health and development, education and childhood, creative peace—there are articles about all these. And the names are familiar Quaker names, too, Rowntree, Gillett, Robinson.

The International Review of Missions (January). The indispensable annual survey of the Editors takes over 100 pages. Mr. Edward Cadbury summarizes the growth of the Selly Oak Colleges, and Herr Hans Kosmala discusses the Problems of the Hebrew Christian Church.

World Dominion (January). Mr. Kenneth G. Grubb writes about both "Spain Today" and the murder of three missionaries on the Amazon. An important contribution is Mr. Maurice Whitlow's "Pagan Areas at Home", in which he gives many facts about money-lending in poor areas. The Rev. D. A. McGavran's "An Unparalleled Situation in India" discusses mass movements. Among other contributors are the Rev. J. Ireland Hasler, Dr. F. Norman Green (Kenya), and Dr. B. E. Read, formerly of the Pekin Union Medical College.

The Evangelical Quarterly (January). Dr. R. E. D. Clark writes on "The Modern Denial of Latency", Prof. J. H. S. Burleigh on "The Politics of St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*". Useful historical articles are Dr. A. M. Hunter's "The Education of Calvin", the Rev. S. Leigh Hunt's "Predestination in the *Institutes*", and Dr. John Macleod's "Charles Simeon".

Religion in Life (January). A varied number, to which the English contributors are Lord Lothian ("The Demonic Influence of National Sovereignty"), the Archbishop of York ("Christian Faith and the Common Life"), and Dr. James Moffatt ("Chrysostom"). Dr. Adams Brown writes on "The Need and the Possibility of an Ecumenical Theology", and among many other timely articles the most important is Dr. A. W. Vernon's "The Religious Conflict in Germany".

The Review and Expositor (January). Prof. F. S. Hickman writes on "The Regenerative Note in Modern Preaching", Prof. J. M. Adams on "The Integrity of the Scriptures in Historical Details". Prof. G. S. Dobbins discusses whether the minister can learn from the psychiatrist, while Dr. Carver has an outspoken article on "The King Goes Pagan".

The Yale Review (Winter). An excellent number opens with Mr. Walter Lippmann's "Issues before the next Administration". Captain B. H. Liddell Hart's "The Strategic Future of the Mediterranean" is important, and other political articles deal with Japan and "Transnational Politics in Europe". Prof. H. J. Laski's "The British Civil Service" is an admirable sketch. Mr. J. H. Wellard is a young Englishman with a pronounced inferiority complex, while Mr. Houston Martin prints letters received from A. E. Housman, to whom he wrote with an audacity of which only an American undergraduate could have been capable. There are other good articles and an imposing list of reviewers.

The Harvard Theological Review (January). This number is occupied by three articles, Prof. Raffaele Pettazoni's "Confession of Sins and the Classics", Mr. A. S. Hoey's *"Rosaliae Signorum"*, and Mr. M. L. W. Laistner's "The Latin Version of *Acts* known to the Venerable Bede".

The Anglican Theological Review. Dr. F. C. Grant summarizes the contribution of the Episcopal Church to the Religious Life of America. Miss Mary E. Andrews argues that the party of Christ in Corinth were the *pneumatikoi*.

The Review of Religion (January). This is No. 2 of this journal, which gives signs of being decidedly highbrow. The first article is a dialogue, "The Spirit and the Life", by Prof. J. S. Bixler. "Prophecy and Politics" is an informing study of Martin Luther by Prof. C. C. Richardson. The other articles are Prof. Fritz Marti's "Religion and 'Natural History'" and Prof. R. E. Fitch's "The Social Techniques of Christianity". Half the magazine is again given to book reviews.

World Christianity (Vol. I, No. 1). The official organ of a supra-denominational movement for World Christianity, containing articles from the world's press and reviews of books.

The current number of **In Extremis** (three Swiss francs annually), the organ of the Student Christian Movement in Switzerland, now beginning its third year, contains articles by Brunner and Barth, respectively entitled *Abrahams Glaube* and *Pourquoi le conflit ecclésiastique allemand intéresse-t-il l'Eglise tout entière?* This combination should not blind readers to the extremely one-sided character of the magazine, which, as its title suggests, stands boldly for the dialectical theology; the predominance of Basle in the addresses of those concerned with the magazine is significant, and even there the more liberal position, as defended by Wernle, would seem to be unrepresented.